

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 31, 1990

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 31, 1990.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## PRAYER

The Reverend Barbara St. Andrews, the Episcopal Diocese of California, San Francisco, CA, offered the following prayer:

O God of light, whose presence fills our hearts with peace when we await in stillness, arouse in us a deep compassion for human need and a resolution to fulfill responsibilities carried as a charge from Thee. Pour out abundant faith that we may witness to Thy power in tasks both great and small, and grant a faithfulness to those we serve at home, abroad, and in those circles where personal care and loyalty give strength to family ties. Enable us to transcend petty divisions and limited thinking and to open channels for Thy grace in mind and action. Keep always this Nation and her servants under the protection of Thy eternal care. May divine love in Thee meet divine love in us to create a perfect union of understanding. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the

point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 301, nays 100, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—301

Ackerman	Emerson	Leath (TX)
Akaka	English	Lehman (CA)
Alexander	Erdreich	Lehman (FL)
Anderson	Espy	Lent
Andrews	Evans	Levin (MI)
Annunzio	Fawell	Levine (CA)
Anthony	Fazio	Lewis (GA)
Applegate	Feighan	Lipinski
Archer	Fish	Livingston
Aspin	Flake	Lloyd
Atkins	Flippo	Long
AuCoin	Foglietta	Lowey (NY)
Ballenger	Ford (MI)	Lukens, Thomas
Bartlett	Frank	Manton
Bates	Frenzel	Markey
Bellenson	Frost	Martin (NY)
Bennett	Gallo	Matsui
Bereuter	Gaydos	Mazzoli
Berman	Gedjenson	McCloskey
Bevill	Gephardt	McCollum
Bilbray	Geren	McCrery
Boggs	Gibbons	McCurdy
Bonior	Gillmor	McDade
Borski	Gilman	McDermott
Boucher	Glickman	McEwen
Boxer	Gonzalez	McHugh
Brennan	Gordon	McMillan (NC)
Broomfield	Gradison	McMillen (MD)
Browder	Grant	Meyers
Brown (CA)	Gray	Mfume
Bruce	Green	Michel
Bryant	Guarini	Miller (CA)
Bustamante	Gunderson	Mineta
Byron	Hall (TX)	Moakley
Callahan	Hamilton	Mollohan
Campbell (CA)	Hammerschmidt	Montgomery
Campbell (CO)	Harris	Moody
Cardin	Hatcher	Morella
Carper	Hayes (IL)	Morrison (CT)
Chapman	Hayes (LA)	Morrison (WA)
Clarke	Hertel	Mrazek
Clement	Hoagland	Murtha
Clinger	Hochbrueckner	Myers
Coleman (TX)	Horton	Nagle
Collins	Houghton	Natcher
Combest	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Condit	Hubbard	Nelson
Conte	Huckaby	Nielson
Conyers	Hughes	Nowak
Cooper	Hyde	Oaker
Costello	Jenkins	Oberstar
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Obey
Crockett	Johnson (SD)	Olin
Darden	Johnston	Ortiz
Davis	Jones (GA)	Owens (NY)
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Owens (UT)
Dellums	Jontz	Oxley
Derrick	Kanjorski	Packard
Dicks	Kaptur	Pallone
Dixon	Kasich	Panetta
Donnelly	Kastenmeier	Parker
Dorgan (ND)	Kennedy	Patterson
Downey	Kennelly	Payne (NJ)
Durbin	Kildee	Payne (VA)
Dwyer	Klecza	Pease
Dymally	Kolter	Pelosi
Early	LaFalce	Penny
Eckart	Lancaster	Perkins
Edwards (CA)	Laughlin	Petri

Pickett	Schulze	Thomas (GA)
Pickle	Schumer	Thomas (WY)
Porter	Sharp	Torres
Poshard	Shaw	Torricelli
Price	Shumway	Towns
Pursell	Shuster	Traficant
Quillen	Sisisky	Traxler
Rahall	Skaggs	Udall
Rangel	Skeen	Unsoeld
Ravenel	Skelton	Valentine
Ray	Slaterry	Vander Jagt
Rinaldo	Slaughter (NY)	Vento
Ritter	Smith (FL)	Visclosky
Robinson	Smith (NE)	Volkmer
Roe	Smith (NJ)	Walgren
Rohrabacher	Smith (VT)	Walsh
Rose	Snowe	Washington
Rostenkowski	Solarz	Waxman
Roth	Spence	Weiss
Rowland (CT)	Spratt	Weidon
Rowland (GA)	Staggers	Wheat
Russo	Stallings	Whitten
Sabo	Stark	Williams
Saiki	Stenholm	Wilson
Sangmeister	Stokes	Wise
Sarpalius	Studds	Wolpe
Savage	Swift	Wyden
Sawyer	Synar	Wylie
Saxton	Tallon	Yates
Scheuer	Tanner	Yatron
Schiff	Tauzin	
Schneider	Taylor	

NAYS—100

Armey	Hansen	Rhodes
Baker	Hastert	Ridge
Barton	Hawkins	Rogers
Bentley	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Billakis	Henry	Roukema
Billey	Herger	Schaefer
Boehlert	Hill	Schroeder
Brown (CO)	Holloway	Schuette
Buechner	Hopkins	Sensenbrenner
Bunning	Hunter	Shays
Burton	Inhofe	Sikorski
Clay	Ireland	Slaughter (VA)
Coble	Jacobs	Smith (TX)
Coleman (MO)	Kolbe	Smith, Denny
Coughlin	Kyl	(OR)
Courter	Lagomarsino	Smith, Robert
Craig	Leach (IA)	(NH)
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lewis (FL)	(OR)
DeLay	Lightfoot	Solomon
DeWine	Lukens, Donald	Stangeland
Dickinson	Machtley	Stearns
Dorman (CA)	Madigan	Stump
Douglas	Marlenee	Sundquist
Dreier	Martin (IL)	Tauke
Duncan	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Upton
Fields	Miller (OH)	Vucanovich
Gallegly	Miller (WA)	Weber
Gekas	Moorhead	Whittaker
Gingrich	Murphy	Wolf
Goodling	Parris	Young (AK)
Goss	Pashayan	Young (FL)
Grandy	Paxon	
Hancock	Regula	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Carr

NOT VOTING—29

Barnard	Fascell	Mavroules
Bateman	Ford (TN)	McNulty
Bosco	Hall (OH)	Neal (NC)
Brooks	Hefner	Richardson
Chandler	Hutto	Roberts
Coyne	James	Roybal
de la Garza	Kostmayer	Smith (IA)
Dingell	Lantos	Walker
Dyson	Lowery (CA)	Watkins
Engel	Martinez	

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

□ 1221

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. DOUGLAS] please come forward and lead the Members in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. DOUGLAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3792. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for the Department of State, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating February 16, 1990, as "Lithuanian Independence Day."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing February 18, 1990, and ending February 24, 1990, as "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of S. 1838.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS ON THIS LEGISLATIVE DAY

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time today for the Speaker to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight when the Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately op-

posite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

#### BUDGET FAILS TO RESPOND TO 1990'S CHALLENGE

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the President presented his first budget of the 1990's. I think all Members recognized that the 1990's are a crossroad for this Nation as we face the changing world, as we face an economy that is beginning to slow down in this country, as we face the legacy of debt and unmet needs that have to be addressed. This is a true challenge for leadership in this country and the leadership for the future.

Unfortunately, the budget fails to respond to that challenge and presents a set of very mixed messages to the country. It tries to define the crisis we face without taking action on that crisis. It denounces timing shifts, while implementing some \$8 billion in timing shifts as part of the budget. It talks about defense cuts, without addressing any cuts in the very expensive strategic weapons that are eating our budget alive. It proposes benefits for the very wealthy, while proposing freezing cost of living increases for retirees, as well as a \$5.5 billion reduction in Medicare.

The challenge is for both the President and the Congress. I think all Members are very tired of the games that have been played with the budget in the past. The people are tired; the Congress is tired. However, obviously the budget presented in the case of the President still is not.

#### HOPE FOR CONTINUED BIPARTISAN COOPERATION

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to first express my thanks for honoring my request that we defer consideration of the driver-voter registration legislation until next week in order to give Members more opportunity to digest what it is about, even though we will be considering the rule today. That will be a controversial rule, to some degree.

The reason I rise is, although I do not see the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] on the floor, but he has done such a yeoman job on the Democratic side of the aisle on the Task Force on Campaign Reform, working with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VANDER JAGT] on our side on the same issue, and I do not want my opposition to the voter registration matter, which was not a part of those over on negotiations on campaign reform, to in any way prejudice what I see down the road as an opportunity for both parties to continue to work together in some kind of overall package on campaign reform.

#### APPEAL FOR BUDGET SOLUTIONS

(Mr. FAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, George Bush's lips say the future but his budget speaks of the past.

His first solo budget is replete with accounting gimmicks, unrealistic economic assumptions, and deficit reduction measures which have been repeatedly rejected on a bipartisan basis by Congress and the American people.

It cites numerous problems, but doesn't provide the resources to deal with them. And it continues the tremendous human and physical disinvestment which characterize the Reagan budgets of the 1980's.

If George Bush is looking to recycle the failed proposals of the Reagan years, and if he thinks this Congress and the American people will stand by and accept them, he is as wrong as the phony premises on which this budget is based.

We have real problems which need real solutions, not another grab bag of fantasies and illusions.

Mr. President, it is time to put aside the political slogans of the past and make the 1990's a decade to reverse the failures of neglect in the 1980's. Let us not continue to pass the buck to the next generation of Americans.

□ 1230

#### TIME FOR CONGRESS TO GET DOWN TO SOLVING CRITICAL PROBLEMS

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment with regard to my concern about us in this body getting on with solving the problems of this country. Most of us have been home. One of the messages I received when I was there was that we were not particularly noted for being



effective in the last session. We did not address many of the problems before us.

A great many of those issues continue. We are talking about competitiveness, the environment, air quality, foreign aid, and a great many other domestic problems, and most important of all, dealing responsibly with the national budget. I know that we have different views, and that is healthy. We ought to have a forum for discussion. But I think it is time that we get past partisan political bashing of the President, and that we move on and get beyond the posturing on defense for our own interests and move forward to solving the problems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to get on with it.

#### INVEST IN AMERICA'S FUTURE, NOT STAR WARS

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, everyone in America seems to know the world is changing—everyone but George Bush.

This week he sent up the same tired old budget we have seen for the last decade, the same strategic weapons that don't work, the same domestic cuts, the same old budget gimmicks.

America is no longer competitive in language, engineering, or math—yet student loans are cut.

Our Nation cries out for health care—yet \$6 billion is cut from Medicare.

Europe is in revolt for democracy—yet Bush's answer is billions for the B-2.

The administration still seems lost in a vision of star wars—while working families fight the battle for America's future alone.

#### AMERICA'S FINEST WELCOMED HOME FROM PANAMA

(Mr. McCRERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCRERY. Mr. Speaker, today we welcome home from Panama some of America's finest—the final contingent of Task Force Regulars from the 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized) stationed at Fort Polk, LA.

They are all to be commended on their outstanding performance in meeting their Operation Just Cause mission, perhaps one of the most difficult. The Task Force Regulars successfully overtook the Panamanian Defense Forces' headquarters, displaying their skill and courage in the face of incessant PDF rocket-propelled grenades, mortars, and automatic weapon fire.

The direct and vital assistance of these soldiers contributed to the overall success of the U.S. operation to protect American lives, ensure the integrity of the Canal Treaty, install the freely elected leader, President Endara, and, bring Manuel Noriega to justice.

Soldiers, please know that your fellow Americans celebrate your success and commemorate your service to our country. We owe you a debt of gratitude for your selfless dedication to duty.

But, as we celebrate the return to Fort Polk of the last contingent of Task Force Regulars, our jubilation is made bittersweet by the cold reality that not all of our boys will know the warm embrace of this grateful Nation.

We mourn the loss of 23 military personnel who lost their lives in Panama. I particularly want to remember the two from Fort Polk's 4th Battalion, 6th Infantry, Cpl. Ivan Perez and Pvt. Kenneth D. Scott.

To their family, friends, and those who fought along side them, I offer our most sincere condolences.

We will never forget their sacrifice. We remember who they are, what they did, and why they had to be brave for us.

Our freedom, and that of freedom-loving peoples around the world, is not free. And to those who paid for it with their blood, and to those who put themselves in harm's way in duty to their country. I extend my heartfelt gratitude.

I would add a sincere thank you to the families of all the personnel sent to Panama. You have your own jobs in support of the country and our military efforts—that is loving, supporting, missing and worrying about your spouses, family, friends, and neighbors who comprise our military personnel.

As the final contingent of the Task Force Regulars from Operation Just Cause returns to Fort Polk, let us rededicate ourselves and our Nation to the noble ideals of peace and freedom and justice, which they so valiantly served.

#### MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS HARMED BY THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I spent the last 2 days studying the President's budget and have come to one inescapable conclusion: President Bush must not know very many middle class Americans. If he did, he would certainly realize that his budget does virtually nothing for the middle class and does quite a bit of harm to it.

Middle class Americans are disturbed about the high cost of sending

their children to college, and yet President Bush cuts the Guaranteed Student Loan Program by \$758 million.

Middle class Americans are incensed that the Tax Reform Act of 1986 took away their IRA's. What does President Bush propose? An anemic little family savings plan that is not even close to the original IRA concept. Under the original IRA concept they were allowed to deduct both the amount they put into a savings account and the interest earned. Under President Bush's plan, only the interest would be deductible.

Middle class Americans want the Government to make investments in America that will yield future jobs, and yet the President lets the surplus in the highway trust fund continue to build up rather than building the new roads and bridges needed to bring goods to market.

Mr. Speaker, I guess there are not very many middle class people up there in Kennebunkport. If there are, President Bush must not know them.

#### THE BUSH MILITARY BUDGET

(Mrs. BOXER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, the Bush military budget actually reverses a downward trend that was started last year.

In 1989, we went from a \$303 billion budget to \$299 billion in 1990—a reduction.

This year Bush wants to go from \$299 billion up to \$304 billion—reversing the trend. And this in spite of Richard Perle, the major Republican cold warrior, who said:

East European political reforms have eliminated any possibility of a Soviet attack against Western Europe, potentially allowing the U.S. military to cancel virtually the entire "next generation" of major tactical and strategic weapons systems.

This in spite of 60 of the top 100 defense contractors who are under investigation.

This in spite of a tremendous deficit and needs in this country for health care, homeless, education, the drug fight, environmental cleanup.

It is clear that the Congress must lead on this budget.

It is clear that with intelligent planning we can wean this country from a bloated military budget gradually and carefully and in doing so bring down the deficit and bring our economy into the 1990's with America as the leader once again.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARIE IMMACULEE SARDEGNA

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise a good person, a woman who has dedicated her life to her faith in God and to Catholic education, and on the occasion of being awarded the St. John Neumann Award for outstanding service by the Syracuse chapter of the New York State Federation of Catholic School Parents.

I know firsthand the benefits of that dedication. Sister Marie Immaculee Sardegna has been a teacher at Most Holy Rosary School in Syracuse for 14 years. Sister Immaculee has taught two of our children, Ben and Jed, and my wife and I look forward to our youngest, Maureen, being in Sister's class next year.

As my colleagues know, and as most American parents trust, we in Congress hold top-notch educators in high esteem. President Bush has said he wants to be remembered as "the Education President." As a Member in the House supports the President's encouragement of quality educational systems, I want to praise Sister Immaculee today as an outstanding example of the classic educator.

As a reading specialist certified to teach in my home State of New York, and also in Pennsylvania and Maryland, Sister Immaculee has brought the blessings of knowledge to an impressive number of young students over three decades.

Sister Marie, a member of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary since the early 1950's, is a graduate of St. Mary's Assumption High School in Scranton, PA. She received her B.S. and M.S. degrees in elementary education at Marywood College.

In addition to her teaching duties, Sister Marie has also prepared children for the sacraments of "Reconciliation and First Eucharist" for 20 years.

It has been said that a teacher affects eternity, that she can never tell where her influence stops. In the case of Sister Marie Immaculee, I know well the positive influence she has had on my community and my family. We all wish her well in her continuing career.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—A ROADMAP TO NOWHERE

(Mr. NAGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a deep sense of sadness and disappointment: sadness for my country; disappointment in our President.

The President's budget, plainly put, is a budget of lost opportunities.

He had the chance to be a historic President, in historic times. He

shunned it. He had the chance to be a great President; but he didn't even try.

The times cry out for a President who will lead this Nation in making the hard choices we must make if we are to meet the enormous challenges we face as we move into the 1990's and the 21st century.

Instead, George Bush has chosen to be only a President who guards his standing in the popularity polls.

America has many needs, but the biggest is a President who sees historic opportunity and takes it.

I think I speak for many in this Chamber when I say the rhetoric of the President's inaugural address, the rhetoric of his speech a year ago to a joint session of the Congress, and the rhetoric which has surrounded much of his talk about this budget, inspired confidence, optimism and an honest desire to join together in bipartisan cooperation.

The reality, however, is that this budget is a blueprint for staying the same. It has no vision. It repeats the mistakes of the past and does precious little to meet the real needs of the future. It is—in a phrase—a roadmap to nowhere.

Once, he inspired optimism; today, just disappointment.

A President writes his legacy day by day and year by year. So it is still too early to say the final book has been written on George Bush. But it is not too early to observe that the first few chapters are clearly cause for deep concern.

#### TRIBUTE TO LT. COMDR. WILLIAM P. CULLEN

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to the outstanding service of my constituent, Lt. Comdr. William P. Cullen, in his position as the Navy's congressional liaison officer to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Commander Cullen was selected for this demanding and important assignment based upon his proven performance as a fully qualified naval surface warfare officer, and more recently as a naval flight officer serving on the U.S.S. *Midway* [CV-41] forward deployed to the Western Pacific and Indian Ocean. During his tour on Capitol Hill, which spanned both the 100th and 101st Congresses, I and many of my colleagues relied on Lieutenant Commander Cullen's unfaltering dedication and unique expertise.

Due to his superior accomplishments, and upon completion of his current assignment, Lieutenant Commander Cullen has been selected to attend the Armed Forces Staff College prior to returning to the fleet in his

primary warfare specialty. I have the greatest confidence that Lieutenant Commander Cullen will bear his new responsibilities both successfully and admirably, and I am pleased and proud to offer my congratulations and best wishes to him for a bright and promising future. It gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues in recognizing Bill's achievements and service, as well as in wishing him fair winds and following seas.

#### THE VISION OF THE BUDGET

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, a budget is to be a vision stating in hard numbers what has been promised in lofty rhetoric. The American people want to see this vision. We are restless, stirring, knowing we have to grow and build a stronger America.

However, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the President's budget is about. This budget's vision is an optimistic delight, not a budget of growing or building, but of simply sustaining.

This country wants to invest in its future. The President calls this an investment blueprint, but the budget only promises the junk bonds of government investment, promised high return with great risk and likely problems.

Mr. Speaker, I want to invest in America, not run away from it. Crucial infrastructure needs still go unmet: Roads, bridges, airports, shipping ports that make America first. If my colleagues are frustrated by choking traffic, I say, "Don't look to this budget to ease your rush hour. We needed freeway size investment; we got sidewalk rhetoric."

Mr. Speaker, this country is 55th in the world in physical capital investment. It is time for a budget that starts making America No. 1.

#### EQUAL TREATMENT FOR ALL RETIREES

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in light of the proposed budget's freeze on military and Federal retirees' COLA's, I have today introduced legislation requiring the equal treatment of all retirees.

Why are military and Federal retirees again singled out? Why can we not understand that these individuals are also entitled to cost-of-living adjustments? I do not believe one group of retirees should receive preferential treatment over another group.



Although I strongly support the goal of deficit reduction, I cannot in good conscience support any plan that singles out certain retirees for a disproportionate share of budget cuts while fully protecting many other programs.

I say enough is enough! Congress should not stand by idly and permit the inequitable treatment of our senior citizens who have served in the Government and those who sacrificed to serve us in the military.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 144,000 military retirees and 147,000 Federal retirees and their families who reside in the State of Florida. The two bills I have introduced today, one to provide for a COLA for both military and Federal retirees and the other to provide for a military COLA, will assure equal treatment for those retirees.

I urge my colleagues to join this effort in providing equal COLA's for all retirees.

#### THE BRONCO BUDGET

(Mr. ESPY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, when John Elway was asked about his team's chances in the Super Bowl, the quarterback said simply, "We'll show up."

Mr. Speaker, events of last Sunday suggest that was just about all that they did, and that reminds us of this administration's budget. It is here. It showed up. And that is about the best that we can say.

Mr. Speaker, like that team this budget is listless on offense, it is unimaginative, and, like the team, it does not rise to meet the challenges of international competitiveness and emerging changes in world order. Like that football team it is sort of flat in what is the biggest game in town. Like the football team, this administration's budget just showed up.

Mr. Speaker, we are all fans, but we are disappointed. We are disappointed that four-fifths of the spending cuts come from the domestic account side. We are disappointed that in a time of lessening tensions in the world that this budget shows an increase above last year's level for defense spending. We are disappointed that gimmicks, timing shifts and trick plays are still in the game plan. We are disappointed that farmers, and Medicare recipients, and rural Americans, and homeowners and those who depend on mass transit are among many Americans who still suffer from what is an attacking game plan.

Mr. Speaker, the President, like the quarterback, is the leader. He sets the tone for the Nation. He calls the plays. He executes the offense.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the best thing that can be said about the

budget is the same thing John Elway said about his team. It just showed up.

#### INTRODUCTION OF AMERICAN FAMILY REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1990

(Mr. BUECHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once stated:

We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude \* \* \* if we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. Speaker, these words are especially prophetic, considering the events which are occurring in Eastern Europe. For once again, we are reminded that economic statism and collectivism are no substitute for the genius of ordinary people.

These words should also serve as our guide when the much heralded peace dividend occurs. For if we follow the vision and wisdom of our Founding Fathers, we will simply allow the American people to keep more of their hard earned income, to spend or invest however appropriate.

With this in mind, I am today introducing the American Family Reinvestment Act of 1990. This legislation provides almost \$2,200 of direct tax relief to a typical, middle income family of four. That's \$2,200 which they can use for child care, better housing, or even additional savings toward retirement.

Mr. Speaker, if the cold war is really over, let us distribute the peace dividend directly to the American people. For as Thomas Jefferson observed over 200 years ago, they know far better than Congress how to spend it.

#### THE HOUSE IS NOW THE BASTION FOR FREEDOM AND LIBERTY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and thank my colleagues in the House of Representatives for their courageous vote last week in support of the Chinese students. When the House voted overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion 390 to 25, it established itself as the bastion for freedom and liberty throughout the world to support the Chinese students and to support human rights in China.

Mr. Speaker, following the vote, the Chinese Government bitterly stated, "We express great indignation and strongly condemn this hegemonistic act of the United States House of Rep-

resentatives." Coming from them it is a compliment.

Although we lost the override in the Senate by four votes, I believe we made great progress for human rights in China and for protection for the students. Because of the bill, we got an executive directive. Because of the override vote, we got assurance that the students will never be sent back against their will.

Mr. Speaker, we will hold the administration's feet to the fire on this promise.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this House chose to identify itself with the eloquent statement of the one man before the tank rather than associating itself with the strange toast of General Scowcroft to the butchers of Beijing.

□ 1250

#### FOREIGN AID CREDITS SHOULD BE SPENT IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, during a recent conversation with Loret Ruppe, our Ambassador to Norway, I learned that a good part of United States foreign aid is in the form of cash transfers. Cash that those countries use to purchase products from Japan, West Germany, Taiwan.

Other nations do not run their foreign aid programs that way—and they also do not have trade deficits. Instead of cash, their foreign aid consists of lines of credit so that their own economies benefit.

My colleagues may be interested in knowing that some of the money we gave to the Nicaraguan opposition for their election campaign went to purchase jeeps from India. They have bought 22 so far and have plans to buy 71 more vehicles while here in the States our auto industry is in a slump.

Are we running an export promotion program for other countries? Does American business not deserve our full support in providing jobs for our citizens?

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to re-examine how our foreign aid really works and move toward credits to be spent in the United States rather than cash to be expended in other countries.

#### GOOD CITIZENSHIP CAN BE A LEARNING EXPERIENCE

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tonight, President Bush will

give Congress and the American people his assessment of the State of our Union. These occasions are frequently little more than a stage on which a President unveils new initiatives by which the resources of Government will be brought to bear on pressing national problems. I hope, however, that Mr. Bush will use the forum he will have tonight to issue a call, for a renewal of the spirit of community service by which our people can bring their best resources—their selves—to bear on some of those same problems.

It is easy to lose sight of the fact that the maintenance of any society, particularly a democratic society, is a shared enterprise that must involve the collective attention and effort of all its people. While we have done a great job of educating our young people about that to which they are entitled as American citizens, we have done a poor job of teaching them what is expected of them as citizens. I believe that it is wrong, and dangerous, to allow a belief to take root in this country that acts like feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, keeping our public areas clean, and supporting the efforts of our public safety officers are always someone else's responsibility or the responsibility of Government.

Sadly, that kind of attitude is all too prevalent today. To that end, I have joined Congressman BILL FORD of Michigan in introducing H.R. 2591, the Service to America Act, which will help local school systems and institutions of higher learning tap the huge potential for community service represented by America's 60 million kindergarten through college age students, by making such service a part of their curricula.

Mr. Speaker, through example, encouragement, and the provision of opportunities to participate in it, serving others can become a lifetime habit for our young people. I can think of few habits that would better enhance the State of our Union.

#### A WARM WELCOME TO THE MOST POPULAR PRESIDENT IN HISTORY

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout the decade of the 1990's we would listen to colleagues the day after the State of the Union Message take the well and bash President Reagan. I will tell Members that we this morning have been listening to some very well-scripted attacks on the budget which has been submitted here by President Bush, and I suspect that tomorrow morning we will hear a few

people bashing the President's State of the Union Message.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that in about 8 hours the President will be standing right here providing his first State of the Union Address to the American people, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I will warmly welcome the most popular President in history.

#### BROKEN PROMISES IN THE BUDGET

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I want the President and Congress to know that we in North Dakota have had our fill of broken promises in the Federal budget. Here is a story. Forty-five years ago the Federal Government came to us in North Dakota and said they wanted permission to build a permanent flood in our State. They wanted to harness the Missouri River for downstream interests.

The Federal Government said if we allow this permanent Rhode Island-size flood in our State, then they would provide us a water diversion program as compensation for it.

Well, we got the flood all right, but now the President's budget breaks that promise. He says we want what the Federal Government got, but we are not going to give you what we promised you. The President calls for scrapping this project.

Mr. Speaker, I am sending the President today a bill, a voucher for \$680 million. That is what the President and what Congress owes my State.

I say to the President and Congress this: If you do not want to keep your word and build this project, then pay us money you owe us. If you do not want to pay us the money you owe us, then give us the dam you built that created the flood and we will sell the electricity every year and make \$18 million a year and build our own project and create our own economic development.

There are three ways: Build the project, pay us the money, or give us the dam. We intend to keep the commitment that we made to the Federal Government, and we darn well expect the Federal Government to keep the commitment they made to North Dakota.

#### PROSECUTE THOSE WHO DESECRATE AMERICAN SYMBOLS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the patriotic symbols that we hold dear in this country are very important, or should be very important,

to each and every one of us. Over the past year we have seen people desecrate the American flag, and we have not been able to get a constitutional amendment passed to make that an illegal act. We passed a law, but many Members do not think that is enough. Something needs to be done to protect those sacred symbols.

Today, just a few minutes ago, some people threw what appears to be blood on the front columns of the Capitol of the United States of America. I think this body and the other body should let the people of this country know, and let those people who perpetrate those crimes upon our symbols know, they are going to have to pay a severe price for that.

I submit that all Members ought to be indignant and let the people of this country know we are going to support our symbols and get those people prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

In addition, if that is blood, those men cleaning it up may be at risk. We do not know whether this is contaminated blood or not. I think that should be investigated and that should be added to the charges against those individuals that perpetrated that crime on this Capitol.

#### A BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE, OR AN AUTOPSY OF THE PAST?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget is supposed to be a blueprint for America's economic future. The fact is, President Bush's 1991 budget seems like an autopsy report from America's past. This budget continues to kill and dash the hopes of many Americans.

What I really want to talk about today is how I keep hearing the screams for a balanced budget amendment. Why have neither President Reagan nor President Bush submitted a balanced budget to this Congress?

When I hear that the President wants to comply with Gramm-Rudman, that takes the cake. That is like fighting fire with gasoline.

What really ticks me off today, and I have to say it, is that camera in the center aisle which will beam the President's speech all over the world is an Ikegami 322, made in Japan. That is about the status of the American Congress and our budget, folks.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING—PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, we received a budget this week that was supposed to be the President's proof



that he was serious when he claimed he wanted to be the education President. Well I am tired of hearing such hypocrisy. Simply put, a budget that is unable to even keep up with inflation does not make an education President. It takes guts and some conviction to earn that title and I see neither of those characteristics in President Bush.

When we are crying out for more college graduates as scientists and mathematicians the President abolishes the State student incentive grants. This means that 200,000 less grants will be awarded next year; 200,000 less students get our help. When we talk about opening the doors of education to every qualified student, no matter their economic level, the President cuts out all contributions to the Perkins loans that are designed to help the most financially needy students. This translates to losing 120,000 loans to struggling students. No one else steps in to take up this burden, 120,000 students must simply do without.

Where is the sense in all of this. I see none and I hope that your eyes are open wide enough to realize that this is not an acceptable budget.

Mr. President, it is time to get serious about education and it is time to put up or shut up. The Congress is ready, with or without you.

#### FOREIGN AID SHOULD BE USED TO BUY AMERICAN PRODUCTS

(Mr. JONTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, 22,000 Chrysler workers are now on layoff, over 500 in the Jeep plant in Toledo and 1,500 in my own district, and where does the National Endowment for Democracy go to buy 50 Jeeps to send to the opposition party in Nicaragua for their campaign?

To India. India, one of three countries cited by our Government as guilty of pervasive unfair trade practices, India, which has an import tariff of 190 percent on trucks, and a 98-percent domestic content requirement. India got started making Jeeps with machine tools that came from Toledo, OH, 30 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know, what is wrong with using American tax dollars to buy American Jeeps? Surely President Bush would waive the trade embargo against Nicaragua so that American workers could benefit from their own tax dollars.

I confess, I was against the \$7 million going to Nicaragua in the first place. I did not think we ought to be spending our money to influence their election. But surely, do not the workers of this country whose taxes finance this aid deserve more while they

are standing in line for unemployment than a kick in the pants from our own Government?

□ 1300

#### CONGRESS NEEDS TO OVERHAUL THE FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET LIKE NAVAL ORDNANCE IN LOUISVILLE OVERHAULS GUNS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Overhaul, Mr. Speaker, the operative term is overhaul. If we in Congress overhauled the President's fiscal year 1991 budget with the same precision and with the same care that Naval Ordnance Station at Louisville overhauls the guns and fire control systems which the Navy needs to do its mission at sea, then we will have produced a better budget. But the irony here, Mr. Speaker, is that the Pentagon has targeted the Naval Ordnance Station at Louisville for possible closure. I intend to fight this closure. My allies in this fight are the Governor of Kentucky, Wallace Wilkinson, Mayor Jerry Abramson, County Judge Executive Dave Armstrong. We will fight together to save Naval Ordnance Station.

We all appreciated yesterday when we met here in Washington the kind attentions of Speaker FOLEY and Chairman ASPIN.

Overhaul, Mr. Speaker, that is the word. We need to overhaul the budget just like Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, overhauls the Navy's 5-inch guns.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO LONGWOOD HIGH SCHOOL CHEERLEADERS

(Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to the Longwood High School junior varsity and varsity cheerleading squads, who recently captured first and fifth places in their respective divisions at the "U.S. National Championship" held in Nashville, TN and sponsored by the International Cheerleading Foundation.

To be selected to take part in what was billed as the largest cheerleading competition ever held, with over 4,000 teams from the United States and Canada competing, is quite an accomplishment. But to travel to Nashville, TN, and successfully challenge the national powerhouses of the South on their home turf, places these Long Island cheerleading squads in an elite class. Their collective talents com-

bined with strict discipline and the dedication to be the best, have helped revolutionize the sport of cheerleading. Their efforts are to be commended.

I join Longwood High School and the entire Long Island community in saluting the Longwood High School cheerleading teams on their achievements, and wish them continued success in future competition and in roaring the Lions onward to victory.

#### BUSH'S BUDGET CUTS DEFICIT IN HALF? HOGWASH!

(Mr. APPELGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, I looked at the budget and I saw what I saw, but I am not sure of what I saw. I saw a \$1.25 trillion in expenditures, the biggest budget buildup we have ever had in this country. Phony economic projections. I saw what they call lower interest rates, and we know that will not happen because the Japanese control those. Yet they say they are going to cut the deficit in half. I think that is a bunch of hogwash.

I think they had better Windex their mirrors and get the smoke out of their eyes. This budget is just like it has always been: It is the rich getting richer, and the poor getting poorer.

Nothing new in the last 9 years. It is tax breaks for corporate America, and it is communities, their workers and the unemployed who are going broke.

I think we had better start looking out for middle America; those are the people that made America the country it is today.

#### CONGRESS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENACTING BUDGETS

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to join this "funny hour" this afternoon, but after listening to some of these statements, I feel compelled to do so.

Does anybody realize that this Congress in the last 9 years has not enacted one Presidential budget, not eight of them for Ronald Reagan and not one for George Bush?

So, therefore, if we hear all these complaints about the budget, it is your fault and maybe my fault or at least whoever voted for those budgets, because the final product was not Ronald Reagan's and not George Bush's.

I listened to all these complaints; then I hear last night a spokesman for the Democratic Party say—and he is the chairman of the Budget Commit-

tee, Mr. PANETTA—that his answer is to ascan the Bush budget the same as he did with every previous Republican budget for the last 9 years and do away with Gramm-Rudman, do away with sequestration, do away with the only discipline that this Congress has at all.

If we had not had Gramm-Rudman and sequestration on the books, think what the deficit would be, gentlemen, all you big spenders. We are going to keep you from doing that. We are going to block Gramm-Rudman repeal because you have to do it legislatively; we have got the votes, along with some good, conservative Democrats, to block your trying to repeal Gramm-Rudman.

I dare you to try it; come on, let's put on the gloves and have a fight.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2190, NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1989

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 309

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2190) to establish national voter registration procedures for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and said substitute shall be considered as having been read. No amendment to said substitute shall be in order except the amendments printed in the Congressional Record on or before February 5, 1990, by and if offered by, Representative Michel of Illinois, or his designee, said amendments shall be considered en bloc and shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto. Said amendments en bloc shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Commit-

tee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2190, the National Voter Registration Act of 1989.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text printed in the report accompanying this resolution. The amendment shall be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and shall be considered as having been read.

The rule further provides that no amendments to the substitute are to be in order except the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on or before February 5, 1990, to be offered by the distinguished Minority Leader, Representative MICHEL or his designee.

The amendments shall be considered en bloc and shall be debatable for 1 hour, with the time equally divided between the proponent and a Member opposed thereto.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments en bloc shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2190, the National Voter Registration Act would create a national voter registration procedure for election of Federal offices. The responsibility for the implementation of the system would fall within the States, with the Federal Government responsible for enforcement, as well as financial and technical assistance.

Under this bill, States that require registration would provide uniform methods to enable voters to register to vote. The first method is the so-called motor-voter procedure, this procedure would allow for voters to register to vote when they apply for a driver's license.

The second method would require each State to make available a form that applicants could mail to an elec-

tion official and be eligible to vote in Federal elections.

The final method would require States to designate some Government locations, as well as private sector locations that would distribute and collect applications for registration.

Mr. Speaker, in order to assure that voter registration lists are accurate and current, H.R. 2190 would require States to update and verify registration lists by providing non-forwardable mailings every 2 years to registered voters or by obtaining information on address changes from the U.S. Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1988 Presidential election, barely 50 percent of the electorate voted, this was the lowest voter turnout in 64 years. One of the primary reasons given by non-voters was that they were not registered. This bill that the House will soon consider will not only increase the opportunity for eligible citizens to register to vote, but also open the electoral process to all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and support the final passage of H.R. 2190.

□ 1310

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the voter registration bill is supposed to be to make it easier for people to vote.

In that spirit, yesterday in the Rules Committee, I offered an open rule in order to make it easier for Members to vote on amendments to the voter registration bill. But instead of welcoming my proposal to allow Members to vote, the Rules Committee by a party-line vote turned down my open rule proposal and instead reported the rule before us today, which closes off all amendments except for one package to be considered en bloc. There is no shortage of amendments to be considered. In the Rules Committee yesterday, the gentlewoman from Nevada, [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] asked to have an amendment made in order to insure that this legislation would not burden the States with a lot of extra costs. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] presented three separate amendments. One was designed to enhance voter participation. A second was designed to ensure that voter registration rolls are accurate. A third would protect the integrity of the electoral process.

Mr. Speaker, these are all reasonable proposals which deserve to be considered separately on their merits, not jammed into an en bloc package where only one vote will be allowed on a large group of amendments.

And certainly opponents of a closed rule cannot argue with a straight face that we need to limit amendments be-



cause it would take too long to consider individual amendments. Today is January 31, the last day of the month, and there have been no long hours spent voting on legislation this last month. It appears unlikely that the schedule in the near future is going to be overcrowded.

The bill made in order by this rule is major legislation which will have an impact on all 50 States. It mandates procedures which may have severe unintended consequences in certain parts of the Nation. If there was ever a bill where Members should have an opportunity to offer amendments to prevent unnecessary conflicts with existing State law and practice, this is it.

I should note that the administration opposes this bill even while endorsing the goal of increasing participation in the electoral process. The administration opposes the bill because the bill would increase substantially the risk of voter fraud, and because a sufficient justification has not been demonstrated for imposing extensive procedural requirements and related costs on the States.

The bill made in order by this rule is not even the same one reported by the House Administration Committee. This rule provides for House consideration of a new bill printed in the report accompanying this rule. The new bill is not just technically different. It is substantively different. Among other things, the new bill will cost more than twice as much as the one reported by the House Administration Committee. If you think you know what you're voting on because you have read the House Administration Committee report, think again.

This is the wrong rule for this bill. The bill has a number of major defects which would have to be corrected before this bill would be acceptable. The rule before us today denies the House the opportunity to consider separately the amendments necessary to make those improvements. Forcing the House to deal with a number of different approaches in 1 hour and with one vote on an en bloc amendment is not a satisfactory solution.

In good conscience, I have no choice but to oppose this rule. It is a gross distortion of what the legislative process should be. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I think we should all be mindful of the hypocrisy involved in considering a restrictive rule for a bill that is supposedly aimed at all things promoting voters' rights. And then when you take a look at this bill, how H.R. 2190 arrived at the Rules Committee in the first place, you can only conclude that this rule adds insult to injury. This rule,

itself, is an antivoters' rights bill. I am shocked that this rule would be on the floor.

Here we have a bill—H.R. 2190—which, in its present rewritten form, has never been voted on by a single subcommittee or rule committee in this House. Neither a voice vote, a show of hands, nor a recorded vote has ever been taken on H.R. 2190 at any stage in the legislative process. And here we are being asked to take it up under a modified closed rule to boot!

At no time during the Rules Committee's deliberations was a single reason given why H.R. 2190 cannot be taken up under an open rule. But here it is—modified closed, by the committee's own definition, not mine. On top of that, not a single proponent of this bill has yet produced a concrete estimate of what it will cost.

And Members heard all these people on this side of the aisle who came here to speak to Members today, talking about how bad the State deficits are. In my State alone, the anticipated cost amounts to twice as much money as this bill would authorize for the entire program nationally. Twice as much. One hundred million dollars foisted on the State of New York to pay for this bill. That is wrong.

If our experience with section 89, which all Members know about, and the Catastrophic Illness Program, which all Members know about, should teach Members anything at all, it is simply: Let Members look before we leap. We are leaping here today. With all due respect to the Members who have worked hard on this bill, H.R. 2190 should go back to the committee. It needs more work. We need to know what it is that we are voting on. Not even the Democratic and Republican proponents of this bill know what is in it. They argued with each other what is in the bill when they came before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I will not belabor the point. At the appropriate time, members of the Committee on House Administration, I am sure, will outline some of the real problems with the bill. On behalf of the members, I offered motions in the Committee on Rules yesterday to make a couple of very important amendments in order. One of the amendments would have provided for Federal funding of the cost the States will be forced to bear in order to implement the mandatory provisions. What is wrong with that? It was not allowed by the committee. Another amendment would have made those mandatory provisions voluntary. What is wrong with that? The committee would not allow them. Both of these amendments were shot down on a party line basis. So much for bipartisanship, my friends.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying, Congress would rather do with what it does best: pass the buck and

heap mandates on local government and on State government. That is wrong, wrong, wrong. Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, I mentioned the word hypocrisy. Every Member wants to encourage greater voter participation in the election process. But when we cannot do it, we cannot do it by denying their elected representatives, you and me, the right to participate and the right to vote in the legislative process here in Washington. Otherwise, why even have elections?

This rule should be defeated, and we ought to go back to committee so we can pass a legitimate voter rights bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is much talk about the closed rule. As Members know, the Committee on Rules allowed the minority leader, as designee, up until February 5 to put any and all amendments into the RECORD to be voted en bloc.

□ 1320

Besides that, Mr. Speaker, we give them a motion to recommit with or without instructions. So I am sure that all the amendments that were spoken about by my colleagues on the Rules Committee can be incorporated by this en bloc amendment. So we are not really shutting anybody off.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for this excellent rule. And I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN], the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, for his contribution.

Voting is democracy. It is how the people choose their representatives. It's how they speak to the Congress. And it's their constitutional right.

But getting the right to speak, through casting your vote, can be an obstacle course. And one of the biggest obstacles is getting registered. Each State has a law. And every law is different. That is what makes this country so diverse, and so great. But that is also what makes registering so difficult.

The constitutional right to vote in Federal elections belongs to the people. It is the same right, no matter what State you live in. So we need to recognize the diversity of the States, while guaranteeing the citizens the right to vote, no matter where they live.

How can we accomplish that as a nation? We can set a national standard. We can require States to adopt one or more of the safe, proven methods of registration. And we can help

the States with the resources to administer their elections, and to maintain their records. At the same time, we can encourage voter registration.

While we must be sensitive to the diverse needs of the States, we must also pay more than just lip service to our citizens' constitutional right to vote.

This rule recognizes the need for all these things. It gives us a bill which has worked out between the committee's majority and minority. It takes into consideration States' needs, the demands of civil rights groups, and the good government efforts of groups like the League of Women Voters.

Members who believe they can improve on the committee's effort can offer a substitute through the Office of the Minority Leader. Each Member will have an opportunity to choose how to support the right of the citizens to vote in his or her State.

I support the constitutional right of the citizens of Illinois to vote in Federal elections. I want the States to have the money they need to administer the elections. And I support and encourage voter registration. That is why I will be voting for this rule, and that is why you should, too.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, welcome to the great voting rights debate of 1990. The only problem is, it will not be all that great a debate. It seems the majority leadership has seen fit to deny the voting rights of the House in considering a voting rights bill for the country. Now there's a liberal conundrum that will leave most people dumb—not ignorant dumb, but dumb in the sense of being unable to speak. But more importantly, this modified closed rule says something about the lack of confidence the majority leadership apparently has in both the bill and the judgment of all Members, Republican and Democrat alike.

You or I might support a restrictive rule if everyone agreed the bill was perfect; but it clearly is not perfect: this is the fourth version the House Administration Committee has come up with. And you or I might support a restrictive rule if the bipartisan leadership asked for it. But our Republican leader officially requested an open rule. And either you or I might support an open rule if no one wanted to offer amendments; but there are a whole passel out there, and we should have a right to offer them.

You or I might agree to a restrictive rule if this were an urgent, emergency situation. But this bill, by its very terms, does not take effect until the 1992 election cycle. And finally, even I might agree to a restrictive rule if we were really pressed for time. But let us

get serious. This is only the second bill this second session has considered in 2 weeks. We are not exactly burning up the legislative calendar with our fast and furious legislative output. At this rate, we will be lucky to consider 40 bills this entire session.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justification for denying the 400-plus House Members who are not on the House Administration Committee their right to offer and vote on amendments to improve this voter registration bill.

And just what is in this bill? Well, I guess it depends on which version you look at. For the information of my colleagues, the bill you got from documents is not what will be under House consideration next week. For that you will have to get a copy of the report on this rule which contains the text of an entirely new substitute written just yesterday.

You will be interested to learn that the latest version increases Federal grant assistance from \$20 to \$50 million. But that is still a drop in the bucket in terms of the additional costs that will be imposed on the States. In Illinois alone it is estimated that the initial cost will be \$37 million, and probably another \$5 million annually in operating costs. That is money that could be spent for the needs of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, concerning those costs, as a member of the Illinois delegation, I would like to add for the benefit of the Members, Democrat and Republican alike, that these costs affect my State and theirs. When Illinois hoped to get the SSC, many of us still supported it because we said it was good for the country and we would have our taxpayers pay for it even though it went somewhere else.

When the savings and loans of California and Florida and Texas needed help, we in Illinois, almost to a person, said, "We are not happy, but it is a national problem, and we will pay for it."

Now it turns out that if it is voter costs or clean air, we have a different standard, and the standard is that the Midwest will pay and pay and pay. If this is that important, if we believe everything we say, then the Federal Government should be paying for it and those costs should not accrue to States that have other needs and other demands for the education of their children and that have not asked for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have a good record on civil rights legislation, but I cannot blindly endorse everything that is presented to us under that label. We all want to increase voter registration and participation. That is not what is at issue here.

I fear that using drivers' license applications to register voters, without up-front notarization, is fraught with all kinds of potential for fraud and abuse. I am sure there are some places

where, if you tell them they can have motor/voter registration, they will be registering people in hearses—before they even get to the cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, this might be an attempt at a national solution, but it is not a rational solution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote down this rule and make sure that we have an open debate on a bill that we can all eventually support.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had a full House of our colleagues because this is a very important issue. I see the number of Members on the floor is very small, and I think that is unfortunate.

Despite the good-faith efforts of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], who is my friend and my colleague and who has been fair and who has been bipartisan in his efforts, I rise in strong opposition to this rule on this so-called motor-voter bill. The rule limits debate on this important issue, and I think that is debate that could lead to positive legislation in this whole area.

□ 1330

We are rushing. My colleagues, we are rushing to make major revisions to the American election process with little or no knowledge where these changes will take us.

I would ask my colleagues, "Do you know the cost of this legislation in your own State?" The Secretary of State in Kansas has estimated \$1.2 million, that he does not know.

"Are you aware of the fundamental conflicts between the election laws of many States and the mandates of this bill? My colleagues, do you realize there are few antifraud provisions in this bill and that the bill, in fact, would destroy antifraud provisions of many States? Do you understand the constitutional question involved with the usurping State authority to regulate elections? Are we sure this legislation, as written, would not severely damage the entire process?"

My colleagues, ask those questions of the supporters of this bill. Yes, my colleagues will get answers, but those answers vary.

Mr. Speaker, any legislation that has such far-reaching impact on one of the cornerstones of the Republic should receive full and exhaustive debate. Every Member, every Member, should have ample opportunity to gauge the impact on his or her State or district. Local election officials, the ones who work at the grassroots level, should be consulted.



All of us here today, every Member of this body, agrees with the general goal of this legislation. That is to involve more citizens in the election process.

However, Mr. Speaker, does this bill really do that? Or does it open wide the door for fraud and abuse and throw out the honored tradition of tying the privilege of voting with the responsibility of being informed about the issues in registering? Is there really a registration problem, or does the dropoff in voting, does the dropoff in voting, go further to a fundamental cynicism in the way voters view their Government?

What this is, what we have here today, is a proposal by well-intentioned colleagues to increase voter turnout by imposing a new, costly, uncertain system of voter registration upon existing State laws and procedures.

With all due respect to my colleagues, what makes the bill's sponsors and supporters believe their new, costly computerized Federal system can do the job better than any of my 58 county election officers and the secretary of state of Kansas?

My colleagues, let us open the rule. Let us look under the hood of motor-voter before we end up in the ditch.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not to argue against this bill. The time will come to deal with the merits of the bill down the line.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do rise to question why in the world on a bill like this, of all bills, why in the world we would have a closed rule.

Yes; I offered three amendments. I think they are reasonable amendments. I think they are amendments that possibly in the en bloc amendment I may be able to get them in. I may be able to get them passed as a part of this bill, but that is not the point.

Why in a bill that purports to open up participation in the electoral process, why in the world would we close participation here on the floor of the House of Representatives? It is the most inconsistent thing I can possibly imagine.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to be ashamed of ourselves for even suggesting such a thing. The reason is that the questions are too numerous, and they have simply not been answered, even in committee or in the Committee on Rules.

Let me just throw out a few of the questions. One is the cost. The proponents of the bill were asked in the Committee on Rules yesterday, "What's this going to cost?" All kinds of figures were thrown out about what it was going to cost. The answer is that

no one knew what it would cost the individual States.

The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] asked, "Well, if it's such a good idea, why don't we have the Federal Government pay this cost?"

The proponents of the bill said, "No, no, we don't want to do that. Let the States pay for it." They did not know the cost, but the States could pay for it.

The question was asked, "Will this help in voter participation? Will more people vote? Will a bigger percentage of the population in the different States vote if this goes through?"

The answer was, "We don't know whether it will help or not. We're not sure. We think it is. It makes sense that more people will register, and maybe more people will vote, but we honestly don't know whether it will or not."

The question was asked whether it will violate the Constitution. The answer is, "We don't know whether it will violate the Constitution or not."

Our Constitution limits the Federal role in elections. The Constitution says that elections, the governing of the electoral process, is a State right and only if there is evidence of fraud or corruption is the Federal Government involved in the electoral process. That is a State issue, but not even the most ardent supporters of this bill would indicate there was any evidence of fraud or corruption. There may be, but that was not the reason for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is to increase participation. We in the Federal Government do not have any role in increasing participation. We have a role in dealing with elections, and fraud and corruption. It is a State issue.

For instance, the bill specifies where we can have, where we cannot have, but where we must have voter registration sites, and it suggests everything from libraries to hunting and fishing license outlets as a place where we can have, we must have, registration. So that means convenience stores in our State, the 7-Eleven's who sell hunting and fishing licenses will also now be voter registration places.

Why does the majority in the House continue to do this, to feel they must ram something through? This is something that we could have sat down, and we could have worked out and let the logical process work instead of putting a closed rule on which limits participation.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when respect for the Congress is at an all-time low we add to it with this kind of behavior.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the issue of changing forms to the "greatest extent practica-

ble." I hold here in my hand a copy of two forms from Minnesota. One is its State social services application, and the other is the unemployment application. Both of these applications have been amended to include the question, "If you are not registered to vote where you live now, would you like to register here today? Yes — No —." And there is a disclaimer in order to let applicants know that they are not required to answer that question in order to be considered for program benefits. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota had no additional costs for amending the State social services application, and amending the unemployment application cost only \$600.

Mr. Speaker, this is clear evidence that amending State applications to inquire for voter registration can be easily done, at virtually no additional cost.

In 1988 Minnesota also included voter registration forms in its income tax booklet. Over 90,000 people registered in response to this effort alone. Clearly, voter registration is an ongoing process that involves people throughout their lives as they move around the country. I believe we should make it as easy as possible for people to register, therefore, I urge and encourage each State to follow Minnesota's models.

□ 1340

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my reservations to the proposed modified closed rule on H.R. 2190, the National Voter Registration Act.

Both the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] have good intentions in this issue, I am positive. I do not disagree with their goal to increase voter participation, but it seems to me that it is rather ironic that we are considering a bill with the premise to increase voter participation, yet should the rule pass, Members themselves will be denied their right to vote. We should be allowed an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, there are Members from both sides of the aisle who have serious concerns about this matter, and like myself, would like the opportunity to introduce amendments which may ensure its betterment. I am sure that most of the Members will agree that our legislative schedule is such that would allow the membership time to take a long, hard look at H.R. 2190, whereas, in the long term, hasty consideration could prove to be nothing short of devastating.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and give those of us who have objections to this legislation the opportunity to express ourselves.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the bill for three reasons that are very simple: it costs too much, it is vague, and it is not needed.

First of all, as far as cost, the Congressional Budget Office estimates the direct cost to the States and to the localities at between \$80 million and \$90 million. That is before some of the figures we have heard here today. For a State like New Hampshire that does not have computerized voting lists, we are looking at the possibility of 221 towns and cities having to get some kind of a uniform computer system and at their expense. The cost to the Federal Government, CBO estimates, will be \$200 million annually, and we only have a \$50 million appropriation. All of this when the other side of the aisle is talking about the homeless and the poor and the folks we need to help. We are going to be wasting money on computers and having towns and cities and States pick up the check for a good idea that is not well drafted.

That brings me to the point of vagueness. Section 106 of this bill is an absolute mess. It requires that each State will have to tell the local registrar of the death, criminal conviction, or mental incapacity of a voter. Let me ask, on a criminal conviction, does that mean after appeal has been exhausted? Does it mean shoplifting? Petty theft? Does it include DWI? That is a criminal conviction that has nothing to do with voting. If they meant a felony, they should have said a felony.

Finally they say mental incapacity. Does that mean one is committed to a mental hospital? Does it mean they are insane as found by a court? Does it mean they are in an alcohol treatment center on election day? We do not know, and if we look at the committee report, page 18, the total explanation for these undefined vague references to mental incapacity and crime are a one-sentence repetition of the language of the bill, no facts, no figures, no definition.

This is an open invitation to civil rights suits, and it is obviously vague and unnecessary, because the States have not asked for this, nor does anybody need this kind of vague language put on the books to hopefully confuse and confound courts across the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the minority leader has asked for time, but he is not here yet. I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has more than one speaker remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker remaining, and that is all.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], who has worked on this bill for the better part of a year and who is probably the most expert Member on this bill, and the Member whom we in the Committee on Rules listened very attentively to and who has done a great job.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this rule is that this is exactly the kind of rule one would write when they have a bipartisan agreement on a bill. When one has bipartisan agreement on a bill, each side makes compromises. Each side gives up something that they would like to have had. Each side has to deal with people on its side and its natural constituency that would have preferred the bill to look differently. This is exactly the kind of rule one writes for that situation.

My colleagues, that is the situation we had for well over a year until Monday.

The minority leader, I understand, has indicated that we should not let this fight today interfere with a bipartisan approach. He said on Monday that this issue should be, and was, clearly a part of campaign finance reform, and today, I understand, he has said that this is clearly separate from campaign finance reform, and we should not let any misunderstandings here wash over onto campaign finance reform and the bipartisan approach to that difficult issue that he has been pleading for for months.

Let us examine the bipartisan nature of this bill. Let us examine the history. The end of the last Congress our committee held hearings, and it happened to be in a hearing in California on same-day voter registration; we were hearing a lot of criticism from election officials about the administrative difficulties of same-day, and the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], and I were trying to figure out what we could do when my secretary of state from the State of Washington, who happens to be a Republican, said, "Why not motor voter?" With that idea, we began to work very carefully together to see if we could not develop an approach that would make it infinitely easier for American citizens to be registered so they could exercise their right, not their privilege, to vote, that did not in-

volve some of the administrative problems of same-day registration. We worked back and forth. We worked together.

There was not a decision made on this legislation at any time from beginning to end in which the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, who is also, incidentally, the ranking Republican on the full committee, did not have full input and agreement, and in that context, we gave up some things, and in that context, he gave up some things. But his bottom line was this: if we are going to write legislation that will add Americans to the rolls, should there not be a section in this bill that would take deadwood off the rolls? It is a little hard to argue with that, except that in many jurisdictions over the years that elimination of deadwood has been abused very badly. I said, "Draft it. See what you come up with." And he did.

We in the majority found that to be a very straightforward address-verification procedure. It had no hidden opportunities for abuse. It was not designed really to discriminate. It did what it said it would do. We examined it carefully, negotiated a bit, and we said, "All right, we will embrace that."

We now have the concept of the legislation worked out in a purely bipartisan way, and then on January 3 of last year, the bill was introduced.

Let me tell the Members the first four sponsors of that bill: a gentleman by the name of THOMAS FOLEY, who at that time was the majority leader of the House; a gentleman named NEWT GINGRICH, who is still the minority whip; a gentleman named TONY COELHO, who at that time was the majority whip; and a gentleman from California named JERRY LEWIS, who is still the chairman of the Republican Conference.

□ 1350

So we have developed a bipartisan concept, and we introduced it with half of the Republican leadership among the first four initial sponsors of the bill. If that does not convey to the majority that we are on the right track and working with the right people, I do not know what possibly it could be that we did wrong.

So we continued to work with this and we got it into legislative language and we did the markups and so on and so forth.

Then a terrible problem occurred for us. Not for the Republicans, but on our side of this issue, among our natural constituency. The civil rights groups began to express a wholly unanswerable anxiety that the section that the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] had insisted be included in the bill might in fact be abused.

I personally spent months working with leaders of the civil rights commu-



nity to persuade them that this was not the case. Very frankly, I had some success, but ultimately failed.

Staff members in the Speaker's office took over the job and worked with these people for weeks and weeks and made more progress, but not success.

Beginning last October the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], the majority whip, spent 3 months, and finally was able to persuade our people that the provision that the Republicans had insisted be part of the bill was a sound provision, a good provision, a provision that did not have any little hooks or nooks or crannies through which discrimination was going to take place, and they signed on.

We took on our own natural constituency and worked with them until we had persuaded them that this was a bill they should support.

Having accomplished all of that, we discussed with the ranking member what the rule should be. As I said at the outset, we came up with the kind of rule that one has when you work out a truly bipartisan bill. Each side has made their compromises and each side wants some protection that their compromises will not come unraveled.

On Monday the minority leader of the House of Representatives swooped into town and trashed the entire agreement.

What more should we have done to deal with this issue on a bipartisan basis? We have half the leadership of the Republican Party as the prime sponsors. We worked with the ranking Republican member of both the subcommittee and the full committee. That is the traditional way you have bipartisanship in this institution.

Would the minority leader like to send to the floor a list of all the ranking Republican Members in this body with whom we should not work? I know as a chairman I would love to have a list from the minority leader of all of the Members he does not want me to work out any bipartisan agreements with because he will pull the rug out from under them.

The minority leader said he hopes this will not interfere with bipartisan efforts in other regards. Mr. Speaker, others have to make the determination, I believe, about this. I believe others will have to make the judgment.

I do not believe I have a reputation in this institution as a partisan person. I feel I have worked with Republicans on this committee, on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and on a wide variety of enormously complex and controversial issues and have never taken partisan advantage.

This bill as it comes to the floor is the product of a careful, long, arduous, difficult bipartisan effort. This, my friends, is the test. We did not

intend it that way. We certainly did not intend it that way. But here it is. Here is a bill on which it is put up or shut up time about bipartisanship.

The rule gives the Republicans two opportunities to change, modify, or kill the bill. It gives our side none. The President has eight points he would like to change. I have a memo in my office, 15 single-spaced pages, changes that people in the civil rights community wanted.

We are going to stick by our word. We did not ask for a substitute in the rule for our side for the simple reason that we are going to stick with the bipartisan agreement.

So far as I know, those people with whom this agreement was made are sticking with it as well. But the minority leader has hung out to dry his whip, his conference chairman, his ranking member, the Speaker of the House, the majority whip, and me. He says that he hopes now that this will not hurt bipartisanship and the spirit of bipartisanship in this body.

There is an old rule that says, "Fool me once, shame on you." I do not intend to provide the opportunity that I shall be fooled again.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from Washington in the Committee on House Administration and I recognize that obviously he speaks from deep emotion.

The person to which the gentleman from Washington is addressing his complaints is not here. In general, some of us at different times, certainly I, certainly the gentleman from Washington, have had times we may have had disagreements with individual Members. I think most often one hopes we can work some of them out in private, certainly with the people here.

I would hope the gentleman would concur with me we are talking about the rule now. Arguments upon the bill which I may have and disagree, and which the gentleman may have and disagree, are held for a time. Talking about the leader of the other party when he is not here, when we have worked so hard, I just do not want to see the bill deteriorate into that.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would point out that the ranking Republican on the Rules Committee holds the time and said the minority leader was supposed to be here. The gentleman had time reserved for him. He could have been here.

The point is that the minority leader has made a point over and over and over again in the previous Congress and in this Congress that he wants a spirit of bipartisanship. I do not be-

lieve that any fairminded person could take a look at how this legislation was developed over a period of well over a year and find any fault with the way in which the Democrats have dealt with the minority on this issue to develop a bipartisan bill.

For the minority leader to unilaterally and singlehandedly trash that agreement on Monday without warning is the issue.

As I said, I will not be fooled again.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in fairness to all and for a full debate on this, since the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] has made some remarks about the minority leader and I have yielded back the balance of my time, I think we should give the minority leader time to respond. I think it was most unfair of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], although I have a high respect for him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). If the Chair could intervene, when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] yielded back the balance of his time, he had 5 minutes remaining. At this point the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to explain. I will yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] if we have an understanding that in the 5 minutes that I yield to him the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] in that period of time if he has any questions.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] had yielded back the remaining part of his time. I believe what the gentleman is asking is to reclaim his 5 minutes, and certainly I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] would object if he understood that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am sorry, I thought the gentleman wanted 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

□ 1400

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, and Members, I apologize because I have been holding other meetings and have not been listening to the debate. I was told that the gentleman from Washington was saying some things about this gentleman from Illinois that there may be some question about.

I would remind the distinguished gentleman that I rose yesterday in a 1-minute speech because I had understood the gentleman was quite concerned about the position that I had taken. I certainly did not intend to give reason for concern, knowing of what he had done with respect to campaign reform and that task force along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VANDER JAGT], and our task force on campaign reform. But this issue as such was not a topic of discussion in overall campaign reform. And that is the big issue over which I was very willing and anxious to work in a bipartisan sort of way.

Then this issue on its own came up. I had not been informed as to how far we were. I maybe have to share some of the blame for missed communication on my side. But I have not been kept as well informed on this one issue as on the overall issue of campaign reform, and I did not want to have the feelings I have about being opposed to this to jeopardize or to taint or to prejudice the other big picture. I am sorry if the distinguished gentleman from Washington should feel so grievous about the position that I have to take on this part of what could conceivably have been incorporated at one time in campaign reform but which we never did frankly consider. It is one, on its own. It is a controversial thing; I am sure it is as controversial on the gentleman's side on some of the issues just as it is on our side. The natural thing to say would be that we ought to have an open rule and have it all aired. I understand that there are some things that the distinguished gentleman from Washington probably would not like to have even offered as amendments on his side, as the gentleman who is carrying it on our side, as the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] thought that maybe there was an accommodation there. But I was not privy to it.

So, you know, I am sorry that the gentleman should have that feeling, because there was certainly nothing intended on my part to gut the gentleman or to turn things on their head here simply because I have a differing view on the specifics of voter registration.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will read my full remarks in the RECORD, and I think he will have a better understanding. He was unable to listen to them as I gave them. I think he will have a better understanding of the reason that I feel that he has made a major attack on the spirit of bipartisanship in this Congress.

I think that is unfortunate. I agree with the gentleman that the road to campaign finance reform is difficult and we will need all the trust between us that we can possibly get on an issue which brings out the paranoia on both sides.

Mr. MICHEL. I made that point all along.

Mr. SWIFT. What the gentleman has done on this bill, perhaps inadvertently, something that raises serious questions to me whether bipartisanship is something that we on our side can safely pursue. And when we have what we believe is an agreement worked out with all of the responsible people speaking for the Republican Party, if the gentleman will not swoop in, as he did on Monday, and trash the whole thing.

If he will read my detailed remarks, he will see the amount of time and effort and the length to which this side has gone in order to reach bipartisan agreement, which we believed we had until it was trashed on Monday.

In terms of whether or not he knew about it, I do not know what is going on in his office. I know his staff has been in touch with my staff on both the substance and the timing on this bill regularly during the last 3 weeks.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 166, not voting 11, as follows

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—254

Ackerman	Gordon	Owens (UT)
Akaka	Gray	Pallone
Alexander	Guarini	Panetta
Anderson	Hall (OH)	Parker
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Patterson
Annunzio	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Anthony	Harris	Payne (VA)
Applegate	Hatcher	Pease
Aspin	Hawkins	Pelosi
Atkins	Hayes (IL)	Penny
Barnard	Hayes (LA)	Perkins
Bates	Hertel	Pickett
Beilenson	Hiler	Pickle
Bennett	Hogland	Poshard
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Price
Bevill	Hoyer	Rahall
Bilbray	Hubbard	Rangel
Boggs	Huckaby	Ray
Bonior	Hughes	Richardson
Borski	Jacobs	Roe
Boucher	Jenkins	Rose
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rostenkowski
Brennan	Johnston	Rowland (GA)
Brooks	Jones (GA)	Roybal
Browder	Jones (NC)	Russo
Brown (CA)	Jontz	Sabo
Bruce	Kanjorski	Sangmeister
Bryant	Kaptur	Sarpalius
Bustamante	Kastenmeier	Savage
Byron	Kennedy	Sawyer
Campbell (CO)	Kennelly	Scheuer
Cardin	Kildee	Schroeder
Carper	Kleccka	Schuetz
Carr	Kolter	Schumer
Chapman	LaFalce	Sharp
Clarke	Lancaster	Sikorski
Clay	Laughlin	Sisisky
Clement	Leath (TX)	Skaggs
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (CA)	Skelton
Collins	Lehman (FL)	Slattery
Condit	Levin (MI)	Slaughter (NY)
Conyers	Levine (CA)	Smith (FL)
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Solarz
Costello	Lipinski	Spratt
Coyne	Lloyd	Staggers
Crockett	Long	Stallings
Darden	Lowey (NY)	Stark
de la Garza	Luken, Thomas	Stenholm
DeFazio	Manton	Stokes
Dellums	Markey	Studds
Derrick	Martinez	Swift
Dicks	Matsui	Synar
Dixon	Mavroules	Tallon
Donnelly	Mazzoli	Tanner
Dorgan (ND)	McCloskey	Tauzin
Downey	McCrery	Taylor
Durbin	McCurdy	Thomas (CA)
Dwyer	McDermott	Thomas (GA)
Dymally	McHugh	Torres
Dyson	McMillen (MD)	Torricelli
Early	McNulty	Towns
Eckart	Mfume	Trafficant
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)	Traxler
Engel	Mineta	Udall
English	Moakley	Unsoeld
Erdreich	Mollohan	Upton
Espy	Montgomery	Valentine
Evans	Moody	Vento
Fascell	Morrison (CT)	Visclosky
Fazio	Morrison (WA)	Volkmer
Feighan	Mrazek	Walgren
Flake	Murphy	Washington
Filippo	Murtha	Watkins
Foglietta	Nagle	Waxman
Ford (MI)	Natcher	Weiss
Ford (TN)	Neal (MA)	Wheat
Frank	Neal (NC)	Whitten
Frost	Nelson	Williams
Gaydos	Nowak	Wilson
Gejdenson	Oakar	Wise
Gephardt	Oberstar	Wolpe
Geren	Obey	Wyden
Gibbons	Olin	Yates
Glickman	Ortiz	Yatron
Gonzalez	Owens (NY)	

NAYS—166

Archer	Barton	Billey
Army	Bateman	Boehlert
Baker	Bentley	Broomfield
Ballenger	Bereuter	Brown (CO)
Bartlett	Bilirakis	Buechner



Bunning	Hunter	Robinson
Burton	Hyde	Rogers
Callahan	Inhofe	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	Ireland	Ros-Lehtinen
Clinger	James	Roth
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Roukema
Coleman (MO)	Kasich	Rowland (CT)
Conest	Kolbe	Saiki
Conte	Kyl	Saxton
Coughlin	Lagomarsino	Schaefer
Courter	Leach (IA)	Schiff
Cox	Lent	Schneider
Craig	Lewis (CA)	Schulze
Crane	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Dannemeyer	Lightfoot	Shaw
Davis	Livingston	Shays
DeLay	Lowery (CA)	Shumway
DeWine	Lukens, Donald	Shuster
Dornan (CA)	Machtley	Skeen
Douglas	Marlenee	Slaughter (VA)
Dreier	Martin (IL)	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Martin (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Edwards (OK)	McCandless	Smith (TX)
Emerson	McCollum	Smith (VT)
Fawell	McDade	Smith, Denny
Fields	McEwen	(OR)
Fish	McGrath	Smith, Robert
Frenzel	McMillan (NC)	(NH)
Galleghy	Meyers	Smith, Robert
Gallo	Michel	(OR)
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Snowe
Gillmor	Miller (WA)	Solomon
Gilman	Moorhead	Spence
Gingrich	Morella	Stangeland
Goodling	Myers	Stearns
Goss	Nielson	Stump
Gradison	Oxley	Sundquist
Grandy	Packard	Tauke
Grant	Parris	Thomas (WY)
Green	Pashayan	Vander Jagt
Gunderson	Paxon	Vucanovich
Hammerschmidt	Petri	Walker
Hancock	Porter	Walsh
Hansen	Pursell	Weber
Hastert	Quillen	Weldon
Hefley	Ravenel	Whittaker
Henry	Regula	Wolf
Herger	Rhodes	Wyllie
Holloway	Ridge	Young (AK)
Hopkins	Rinaldo	Young (FL)
Horton	Ritter	
Houghton	Roberts	

## NOT VOTING—11

AuCoin	Dingell	Lantos
Bosco	Hefner	Madigan
Chandler	Hutto	Smith (IA)
Dickinson	Kostmayer	

## □ 1424

Mr. HORTON and Mr. CONTE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BARNARD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of ascertaining the schedule for the upcoming week, and I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader to explain the schedule for the Members.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the program will be as follows: On Monday, February 5,

the House will meet at noon, but we will not have legislative business.

On Tuesday, February 6, the House will meet at noon. We will consider the Private Calendar, and on suspensions we have four bills. Recorded votes on suspensions will be postponed until after debate on all suspensions. The bills to be considered under suspensions are as follows:

H.R. 2061, Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act;

H. Con. Res. 198, authorizing a performance by the American-Soviet youth orchestra;

S. 1096, to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded the Seminole Indian; and

H. Con. Res. , regarding U.N. participation in Cambodia.

Following those bills and those votes, we will consider H.R. 2190, the National Voter Registration Act of 1989. We just considered and passed the modified closed rule on that bill. There will be 1 hour of general debate.

Members should understand that votes, if there are votes on the suspensions, could come fairly early in the afternoon, and then we will move to the consideration of the voter registration bill.

On Wednesday, February 7, and Thursday, February 8, the House will meet at noon on February 7 and at 11 a.m. on February 8. One of the matters that may come up on those days will be a motion to go to conference on H.R. 1465, the Oil Pollution Prevention Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1989, with 1 hour of debate.

On Friday, February 9, the House will not be in session. We will then begin the Lincoln-Washington district work period. At the close of the week's business, the House will adjourn until Tuesday, February 20.

Conference reports, of course, may come up at any time, and any further program will be announced at a later date.

## □ 1430

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of questions.

Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] correctly, the votes on the suspensions will take place on Tuesday, and Members cannot be assured that those votes would be after 4 o'clock, that the votes could be as early as 1 or 2 in the afternoon. Is that correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. Speaker, is the leadership going to be prepared by next week to give us a tentative calendar for the rest of the month in terms of when we are likely

to be in session in the month after the Lincoln Day recess?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we will.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything on the schedule with regard to the Panama legislation, which I understand is now being worked on in committee and will make it to the floor next week. If that comes to the floor, could the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] indicate to me what day we are likely to consider that?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we are not sure yet that it will. Negotiations are still going on between the State Department, other officials in the executive branch, and different committees here in the House. If that negotiation results in legislation, it would come on Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. WALKER. Come on Wednesday or Thursday, and is the likelihood of that on Wednesday?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me as though the schedule would be fairly well complete by Wednesday if we do not hold over legislation until Thursday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a greater likelihood of Wednesday.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Further, there has been some talk that the Eastern Airlines vote might be coming to the floor next week. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] have any information on that?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, my information is that it will not, but it is still under consideration at a later date.

Mr. WALKER. In addition, Mr. Speaker, would that come on Wednesday as well if that happens?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is the case.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

## ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1990, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, February 1, 1990, it adjourn to meet at noon Monday, February 5, 1990.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

# HOUR OF MEETING ON FEBRUARY 7, 1990

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, February 6, 1990, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, February 7, 1990.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

# DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

# VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) designating February 11 through 17, 1990, as "Vocational-Technical Education Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], who is the prime sponsor of this resolution designating February 11 through 17 as Vocational-Technical Education Week.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the subcommittee leadership for discharging this important joint resolution, and I am appreciative to the majority of my colleagues here in the House and in the Senate for cosponsoring this resolution.

I rise in optimistic support of House Joint Resolution 367, which will designate the week of February 11-17, 1990, as national "Vocational-Technical Education Week." It is quite fitting that educators across the Nation have praised this Congress for recognizing the significance of vocational and technical education, and I am proud to have sponsored this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will help focus national attention on the significance of technical education programs to many of our communities and young adults. This is an educational discipline that by design serves multiple goals—it not only prepares

students for employment, but also encourages these same students to broaden their horizons by providing alternative learning experiences that can reduce the dropout rate in our schools.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, named in memory of a distinguished and outstanding Member of this body who advocated expanding our educational programs, renewed the Federal commitment to augment and improve the quality of vocational education programs as we know it. With increasingly stronger international competition requiring more of our workforce to be well trained, the keen foresight of our sagacious colleague is clearly evident today as foreign businesses continually challenge America's global competitiveness.

In the United States, more than 25,000 vocational and technical education institutions provide nearly 16 million Americans with marketable skills in over 150 occupations. And now we are seeing more and more partnerships occurring in many communities between technical schools and businesses who provide on-the-job-training skills essential for the workplace. Businesses seek workers who have the ability to actively learn, solve problems, and initiate new approaches in industry. Vocational programs offer all of these qualities and more, as evidenced by the growing demand of such graduates by businesses nationwide.

According to the Department of Labor, 80 percent of the jobs in our country require the kind of skills usually taught in vocational-technology educational institutions. Already these students make up a large portion of the high school population in many of our districts. They will be tomorrow's computer operators, programmers, nurses, and lab technicians, to name a few, forging a new and viable workforce for a new and challenging century. Thus, greater attention needs to be brought to the potential that vocational and technical education programs have to offer.

I am especially proud of the significant strides the State of Maryland has taken over the last several years to improve and develop educational disciplines to meet the needs of individual students. Many programs across the country as in Maryland are integrating academics with technical instruction. In fact, 140,000 high school students participated in secondary vocational classes last year in Maryland and 63,000 were community college students. Technical courses are offered in 161 high schools, 30 vocational schools, and 17 community colleges also located in the State of Maryland.

In my own district of Baltimore, where more than 20,000 students benefit from a technical curriculum, Carver Vocational-Technical High

School and Mergenthaler Vocational-Technical High School serve as outstanding models of excellence in technical education today. In particular, Mergenthaler High School has greatly expanded its services to computer labs. With increased emphasis on technical education, they have initiated a valuable program that moves handicapped students into the mainstream of regular programs, and maintains a placement rate of an astounding 100 percent.

With equal prominence, Carver High School has continued to serve the community of Baltimore over the past 65 years and was previously honored by the Maryland State Council on Vocational Education as the most outstanding vocational program in the State of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, vocational programs are taking at-risk students and turning them into productive and contributing citizens around the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the value of vocational and technical education by supporting House Joint Resolution 367.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am pleased to join in cosponsorship of this resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for introducing it and for giving an elaboration of its importance to us in our competitive stance.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], who brought this resolution out on the floor.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 130, to designate the week of February 11, 1990, as "Vocational-Technical Education Week."

Most of my colleagues have some familiarity with the vocational education system. Approximately 75 percent of secondary school students take at least one vocational education course.

Our colleagues may not be fully aware of the significant role this program plays. Nearly one-half of American youth do not go on to college. However, today, some education and training beyond high school is required for entry into about 50 percent of all job classifications. By the mid-1990's 75 percent of all jobs will fall into that category.

For example, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, jobs for technicians will grow by 38 percent by the year 2000—faster than any other occupational group. As new technology spreads, companies need smarter, more flexible employees who can perform a variety of tasks, from installing and monitoring welding robots to reprogramming them if production rates fall.



Vocational-technical education programs in many areas of this country are forging a dynamic link between the classroom and the workplace and are helping meet the Nation's need for qualified workers who have adaptable skills.

In one of the high schools in my district, vocational-technical courses are often taught by "teams" of teachers. Using this technique, one teacher discusses the academic or conceptual framework and the other teacher relates that instruction to the practical applications of existing and developing technology.

The Committee on Education and Labor recently completed consideration of the Applied Technology Education Amendments Act of 1989. These amendments, we believe, will help invigorate vocational education instruction by ensuring that students are offered a combined program of academic skills and that those courses are offered and taken in a rational sequence that can lead to the development of a job skill and academic competence. The legislation also contains a provision that will provide Federal incentives to secondary and postsecondary schools who join together and offer programs linking the last 2 years of secondary training and the first 2 years of college education.

I commend my colleague, Representative Mfume, for bringing this worthwhile resolution to the attention of our colleagues in the House. Vocational-technical programs are on the cutting edge of our Nation's efforts to sharpen our economic tools.

□ 1440

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 130

Whereas vocational-technical education prepares the Nation's workforce by providing students with basic academic and occupational skills;

Whereas vocational-technical education stresses the importance of positive work attitudes and values;

Whereas vocational-technical education builds the leadership skills of students by encouraging them to participate in student organizations;

Whereas vocational-technical education stimulates the growth and vitality of the Nation's businesses and industries by preparing workers for the majority of occupations forecasted to experience the largest and fastest growth in the next decade;

Whereas vocational-technical education encourages entrepreneurship among students through units of study and courses designed to prepare them to start and manage their own businesses;

Whereas a strong vocational-technical education program planned and carried out by trained vocational-technical educators is

vital to the future economic development of the Nation and to the well-being of its citizens;

Whereas the Future Business Leaders of America, the Future Homemakers of America and Home Economics Related Occupations, the Future Farmers of America, the Distributive Education Clubs of America, the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America, the American Industrial Arts Student Association, the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, the Health Occupation Students of America, the National Association of State Councils on Vocational Education, and the American Vocational Association have joined efforts to give added definition to vocational-technical education;

Whereas the planned theme for Vocational-Technical Education Week is "Vocational-Technical Education: It Works": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February 11 through February 17, 1990, is designated as "Vocational-Technical Education Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such period with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.*

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) to designate February 2, 1990, as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority has no objection to this resolution. I would like to commend the gentleman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 82 to designate February 2 of 1990 as National Women and Girls in Sports Day.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly add my words of support and hope that this body will, in unison, support this very important resolution.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 82, the bill I have introduced which designates February 8, 1990, as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day."

Setting aside a day to commemorate the participation, achievement, and excellence of women and girls in sports has been a tradition for 3 years.

Participation in athletics at any level has proven to be significant for emotional and

physical development of our youth. Through sports, girls learn to take initiatives, to work well with other, and develop a positive self-image, qualities crucial in life.

National Women and Girls in Sports Day, while recognizing the outstanding accomplishments of women in sports, will also point to the fact that women students still have fewer opportunities for athletic achievements than men at the same institutions.

In 1988, just 16 percent of the total college athletic budget was allocated to women. One-third of total athletic scholarships were available to women. In high-school athletic competitions, there were two boys to every one girl participating.

While I applaud the progress that has been made over the last 17 years, I believe we must also acknowledge the large inequities that still exist for women in the area of athletics.

It is important that the past, present, and future accomplishments of our Nation's women sports figures be acknowledged. I encourage each of you to recognize the women and girls involved in sports in your district.

For example, I am proud to recognize the accomplishments of athlete Karen Hunter of Bangor, ME. Karen is a member of the U.S. Freestyle Ski Team. As a specialist in the ballet event, she placed seventh in the 1989 World Championships held in Oberjoch, Germany, and is currently ranked third in the United States. Karen hopes to retain her position on the 1991 national team and to qualify for the 1992 Olympics.

I commend Karen's commitment to her sport. I thank Karen for representing the Second District of Maine as an outstanding woman athlete and role model for future athletes.

National Women and Girls in Sports Day will be a step toward giving women in sports the recognition and attention they deserve. Hopefully, this day will encourage more women to experience the pleasure of sports activity that develops lifelong habits of physical fitness.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 82

Whereas women's athletics is one of the most effective avenues available through which women of America may develop self-discipline, initiative, confidence, and leadership skills;

Whereas sport and fitness activity contributes to emotional and physical well-being and women need strong bodies as well as strong minds;

Whereas the history of women in sports is rich and long, but there has been little national recognition of the significance of women's athletic achievements;

Whereas the number of women in leadership positions of coaches, officials, and administrators has declined drastically over the last decade and there is a need to restore women to these positions to ensure a fair representation of women's abilities and

to provide role models for young female athletes;

Whereas the bonds build between women through athletics help to break down the social barriers of racism and prejudice;

Whereas the communication and cooperation skills learned through athletic experience play a key role in the athlete's contributions at home, at work, and to society;

Whereas women's athletics has produced such winners as Flo Hyman, whose spirit, talent, and accomplishments distinguished her above others and exhibited for all of us the true meaning of fairness, determination, and team play;

Whereas parents feel that sports are equally important for boys and girls and that sports and fitness activities provide important benefits to girls who participate;

Whereas early motor-skill training and enjoyable experiences of physical activity strongly influence life-long habits of physical fitness;

Whereas the performances of such female athletes as Jackie Joyner-Kersey, Florence Griffith Joyner, Bonnie Blair, Janet Evans, the U.S. Women's Basketball Team and many others in the 1988 Olympic Games were a source of inspiration and pride to all of us;

Whereas the athletic opportunities for male students at the collegiate and high school level remain significantly greater than those for female students; and

Whereas the number of funded research projects focusing on the specific needs of women athletes is limited and the information provided by these projects is imperative to the health and performance of future women athletes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That February 2, 1990, is hereby designated as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon local and State jurisdictions, appropriate Federal agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Page 3, line 3, strike out "February 2, 1989" and insert in lieu thereof "February 8, 1990".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

#### TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to designate February 8, 1990 as 'National Women and Girls in Sports Day'".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 130 and House Joint Resolution 82, the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### OLDER AMERICANS WOULD BENEFIT BY PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE THE EARNINGS LIMIT

(Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, why is the U.S. Government wasting one of our most valuable assets? I am referring to the spending power and experience of our Nation's senior citizens. If a senior wants to work, the current Social Security earnings limit or "snowcap" penalizes this desire by imposing a 50-percent tax on their earnings.

America was founded on hard work, however, this country is sending the opposite message to seniors—that they are no longer needed, or wanted, to actively participate in society.

It is time for the U.S. Congress to restore this freedom of choice to citizens who want to work and contribute.

Recent studies have indicated that almost any increase in the earnings limit would reduce—not increase—the Federal deficit. A bill introduced by Congressman DENNIS HASTERT, of which I am an original cosponsor, is designed to eliminate the earnings limit. H.R. 2460, the Older Americans Freedom to Work Act of 1989, was introduced by Representative HASTERT. To solve this problem I call on the Ways and Means Committee to bring H.R. 2460, which has 164 cosponsors, to the floor for debate and passage. The needs of this country's senior citizens must be addressed.

Retirement should be a time when the creative energy and experience of seniors, developed throughout a lifetime of employment should be used, not wasted.

#### MELT THE SNOW CAP: TURN SENIORS LOOSE TO EARN

(By Donald E. Lukens)

The U.S. government is *wasting* one of our most valuable assets—the spending power and experience of our nation's senior citizens. This "snow cap" or earnings limit penalizes each senior who earns more than \$8,800 a year over the Social Security benefits. Imagine a citizen who has worked and paid Social Security all of his life not getting the benefits he has already paid for because he or she wants to work!!

Currently, a senior will lose \$1 in benefits for every \$2 he earns over the limit!! This is an effective 50 percent marginal tax rate, which is both poor economic judgment and counterproductive to society. This government invasion of a citizen's life is just another example of unnecessary intervention in the lives of 31 million senior Americans. Current legislation would raise the limit minimally over the next few years, but that's not enough. It's time for the U.S. government to get smart and completely restore this freedom of choice to citizens who want to work!

#### EMPOWER SENIORS TO LEAD MORE PRODUCTIVE LIVES, INDEPENDENT OF GOVERNMENT!!

The government, in its effort to control our tax money, has been greedy with power. It is afraid to give taxpayers a break, not realizing that *allowing people to spend their own money* generates more tax money and more economic activity. More importantly it gives the *individual*, not the government, the *freedom of choice*. It lets you and me decide how to best spend our money. It empowers the individual at the expense of big government. That is what conservatives in Congress are all about—we *trust the individual to make choices*, and we trust the free market to flourish because individuals are free to make these choices. We want to remove this cap and empower, not penalize, citizens who want to work. Let them spend their money how and when they like.

Seniors have more potential spending power than any other group. They aren't saving for the future. They are spending their retirement money—money they have saved for years. They aren't buying new homes or clothes for themselves, but they are *spending* on their children and grandchildren. They are buying goods and services. Their money is going right back into the economy creating jobs and revenue.

#### INCREASE GOVERNMENT REVENUE BY \$4.9 BILLION

A recent study finds that *almost any increase in the earnings limit would reduce the federal deficit* by generating more in new taxes than the government would lose in increased Social Security benefit payments! This study was released by the National Center for Public Policy Analysis and the Institute for Policy Innovation (titled "Paying People Not to Work: The Economic Cost of the Social Security Retirement Earnings Test").

#### INCREASE THE GNP BY OVER \$132 BILLION, STIMULATING ECONOMIC GROWTH

The *Wall Street Journal* reports 83 percent of all men and 92 percent of all women over 65 are completely out of the work force. Three out of five of these do not have any disability that would preclude them from working. *These skilled older Americans, who want to work, are ideal for meeting the labor demands of the future, and without them, we may be facing a crisis.*

#### STOP PENALIZING CITIZENS WHO WANT TO WORK

When you're 65 and ready to retire or want to work part-time or start your own business, do you want the government telling you to stop working or stop earning? No!!! I don't ever want to stop. And if I do, I want it to be my own choice!!!

Recently, a Naples, Fla., realtor wrote the *Wall Street Journal* that he was approaching 65 and would like to keep working to supplement his retirement income. But he figured that with income tax, plus Social Security tax, plus lost Social Security bene-



fits—he would in effect end up paying the government 82 percent of his earnings and keep only 18 percent!! He says, "That sounds like some country on the other side of the Iron Curtain." That sounds like economic slavery to me—working 50 to 80 percent of your time for the federal government without pay! Currently, seniors under 65 working full-time earning as little as \$3.35 an hour will lose \$244 a year in Social Security benefits.

#### HELP THE YOUNGER GENERATION BY SHIFTING SOME OF THE BURDEN OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Currently 12.5% of the population is 65 and older, and it's growing every year. By the year 2030, it is estimated that there will be only two workers for every elderly citizen. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that the 16 to 24 year-old labor force of 24.6 million this past summer was down 706,000 from the year before. This represents a steady decline from a 1980 peak of 28.4 million. At the same time, in 30 years the average age of our population is expected to increase by 24 percent.

America was founded on hard work. (When you penalize, you get less—reward to get more!) It's hard to imagine that productivity is now being penalized!!! Before the Depression, seniors remained active and productive members of society until they were no longer physically or mentally able. Then they were taken care of by their family. The earnings test has been in place since the payment of the first Social Security benefits, which was created during the Depression when jobs were scarce. Its goal was to move older Americans out of the work force to make way for the younger workers. Either intentionally or unintentionally, Congress continues to act as if this were a primary goal of Social Security! Although the test had undergone a variety of changes over the years, it is still nothing more than a penalty and costs the Social Security Administration \$200 million a year to administer. Rich or poor, every older American would benefit from removing it. Simply put, the test is antiquated, inefficient, and ripe for elimination.

#### AGING AMERICA

Removing the Snow Cap earnings test, would benefit all Americans. It gives each citizen the choice to work, regardless of age. It helps the current generation of younger Americans who financially support government programs for seniors, and it stimulates the U.S. economy as a whole. The only ones who benefit from keeping the earnings limit are the socialistic taxaholic liberals who want to keep all the elderly on the same economic plane—poor—and dependent on the government for the rest of their lives.

Currently, pending before Congress is a bill that would completely eliminate the earnings limit for those aged 65 and older. This bill, H.R. 2460, the older Americans Freedom to Work Act of 1989, was introduced by Rep. Dennis Hastert, (R-IL). I am a proud cosponsor of this bill and a member of the Republican Task Force on Social Security Earnings Limit.

#### SAVING FOR SOCIAL SECURITY'S FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, recently I have said that cutting the payroll

tax would destroy Social Security for today's workers. I want to explain what I mean by that.

In 1983, a panel of six congressional leaders crafted a Social Security bailout that was based on partially prefunding the benefits of today's workers.

They knew that prefunding is crucial to the long-range health of the Social Security system because in the coming years we will have more and more retirees and fewer and fewer workers to pay their benefits. The panel rejected a pay-as-you-go system because it simply would not work given the demographics of the 21st century.

Now some members of that 1983 panel—most notably the senior Senator from New York—have turned 180 degrees and irresponsibly rejected saving for the future. At the same time, they deride suggestions that we put Social Security on an even keel by truly saving and investing the Social Security reserves.

Social Security has paid benefits for a half-century precisely because it has been administered with care and foresight. I reject the notion that saving nothing for future benefits shows foresight.

#### END GOVERNMENT MISUSE OF SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, would the President or any Member of Congress dare to tax only lower to middle income workers to balance the budget? No one would admit that they were doing that. But practices which have that effect are the ongoing policy of our Social Security trust fund system. That is why Senator DANIEL MOYNIHAN's proposal is a good idea. His proposal would end the Government's misuse of the Social Security trust fund by reducing the tax so that it is sufficient for outlays and no more. Anyone who studies this trust fund's history and current practices as I have, will learn why the Moynihan proposal is an idea whose time has come.

According to its chief author, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Social Security was supposed to be sacrosanct. Its funds were not to be spent on anything but benefits for those participants who earned them. Social Security was created as a national trust fund, so that each generation of working Americans would provide a retirement pension to sustain the generation that built America before them, and then be sustained in their retirement by the generation which came after them. That purpose has been achieved in a program which ranks as

one of the greatest successes of American Government: The Social Security trust fund.

Over the last several years, however, that original purpose has been lost.

Social Security is now generating large surpluses, surpluses which are not needed for benefits but for deficits.

In fact, many policymakers and editorial writers routinely support delaying Social Security's cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] so that those moneys can instead be borrowed by the Federal Government for deficit reduction purposes. I have strongly opposed these policies over the years, and will continue to do so. Retaining the yearly COLA is a vital priority for Philadelphia and for America.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district, the annual COLA keeps over 1,000 elderly men and women from slipping below the poverty line. In the city of Philadelphia, over 5,000 retirees will stay above that line of economic despair because of COLA's. Across America, half a million senior citizens rely on their COLA for that purpose. And hundreds of thousands will use their monthly checks, with the small increases COLA's provide, to enrich their lives just a little in their retirement.

These small raises in benefits are plowed back into our local economy, across our Nation enriching America. COLA's are also the best insurance that inflation will not rob the worker of today of buying power tomorrow, when they will rely upon their Social Security check.

In addition to imperiling COLA's, using Social Security's funds for anything other than benefits is unfair to the millions of men and women who participate in this program.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security's participants fall into three categories: First, the working men and women who contribute 7.65 percent of their paychecks to Social Security each month; second, their employers who match that contribution; third, and the retired men and women currently collecting the benefits they earned by contributing part of their salaries during their working lives to pay for the pensions of the working generation which precede them.

To serve these three kinds of participants fairly, Social Security must remain sacrosanct, and immune from the pressures of fancy budgetary book-keeping. It should only generate revenues for benefits for its participants. To exact Social Security tax from employers and workers for any other purpose is devious, regressive, and unfair.

But that's exactly what is happening right now. Government is using Social Security to finance our battle against the Federal budget deficit, by borrowing the enormous surpluses generated

by recent increases in the Social Security tax rate.

As you know, in 1983 a bipartisan commission faced the reality that over the next 50 years, the percentage of Americans collecting Social Security will rise dramatically, and the percentage of workers paying the payroll tax will shrink.

The commission persuaded Congress and the administration to pass a law which mandated that the Social Security tax would be raised several times over the years, to amass a surplus large enough to pay the fund's future obligations as they came due. That was a proper goal.

I fully support collecting enough money to pay Social Security's participants their benefits and COLA's each year. In practice, however, the increased Social Security tax has become a back-door subsidy for the deficit.

A look at 1989's figures explains how. The U.S. Government's stated deficit last year was \$152 billion. The real number was \$204 billion, however, because Social Security tax revenues brought in \$52 billion more than was needed to pay last year's benefits.

When Social Security collects funds not needed to meet yearly outlays, it has to invest them so it can afford to pay its obligations in the future. Since no risks can be taken with these moneys, they are invested in U.S. bonds. This means that the Government sells Social Security fifty two billion dollars' worth of bonds, and gets to count those moneys against its \$204 billion deficit, so it can claim a deficit of \$152 billion.

In fact, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this practice will become even more pervasive as the surpluses in the Social Security fund grow. If this practice is not changed, then by the end of the 1990's, the Government will report a \$290 billion deficit as a \$30 billion deficit, because it will borrow the Social Security surplus of \$260 billion. Continuing on the trail of the borrowed Social Security surplus, when the bonds it sells come due, the Government's general fund will have to pay back the hundreds of billions it will borrow. Since the general fund will then have to raise hundreds of billions of dollars plus interest, where do you think they will get the money? That's right—it will come from taxing the working men and women who paid the money into the Social Security fund in the first place.

Making them pay the Social Security fund back with interest for a contribution they have already made is an additional burden of taxation for workers.

It's not right or fair, but it is current practice. Paying that additional tax is not the only unfair burden that current Government practices place on working families. Borrowing the Social

Security tax for deficit reduction constitutes a regressive tax on middle income earners. Income tax is levied progressively on all income above a minimum. Social Security only taxes a person's first \$51,300 earned each year. So if you earn \$51,000 per year, and a friend earns \$153,000 per year, you're paying 7.65 percent of your salary each year for Social Security, and he is paying 2.55 percent of his salary.

Equally unfair is this situation: If a husband and wife both worked—as is common today—and each earned \$50,000 per year that family would pay \$7,650 in Social Security tax each year, while a one-income family whose wage earner grossed the same amount—\$100,000—would pay under \$4,000 in Social Security tax. That could be questioned as a system for paying for Social Security benefits. But there is no question that it is a totally unacceptable way to finance the deficit.

Misusing the Social Security tax also treats another group unfairly; small and startup businesses. Every time the Social Security tax is raised, these small enterprises are hit with an additional payment for each worker.

No one disputes that businesses should have to pay for benefits for Social Security's participants: That is a responsibility they accepted when they opened their doors. But to ask them to bear a special burden to finance the deficit, a greater burden than nonbusiness owners are bearing, is unfair. Either the deficit is important enough so that we should all pay for it, according to our means, or it isn't.

At any rate we should not hide this massive deficit behind trust funds and phony bookkeeping tactics. The cure for what ails Social Security is simple: Since we cannot allow Government to levy a special tax on working people and small businesses to pay for the deficits, we must reduce the tax. We should tax workers and businesses whatever it takes to ensure that we can provide the benefits and COLA's which retirees deserve, and that is all.

Then, Mr. Speaker, as Senator MOYNIHAN says, we will have to find a genuine and fair way to pay for our deficits, not paper them over by taxing working people unfairly. That way we will face our deficits squarely, and solve them, without misusing trust funds, or abusing the trust of America's working people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. COOPER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mrs. BENTLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 1450

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous material, on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### CONFLICT IN CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I requested this special order to focus attention on the tragedy of the ongoing division of Cyprus. Since Turkish forces invaded Cyprus in July 1974, this Mediterranean island has been the setting for one of the most intractable international conflicts. Almost since the bloodshed began, people on both sides of this issue have said the Cyprus problem cannot be solved. They have said this fight is too emotional and contentious, and that the Greek Cypriots and Turkish forces will remain forever deadlocked. I have called this special order today to say that the green line which divides Cyprus and separates families can come tumbling down just like the Berlin wall. Not only can the green line be wiped out—it must be.

The year 1989 was momentous. We witnessed the withdrawal of occupying forces from Afghanistan and freedom breaking through the iron grip of oppression in eastern Europe. As we



begin the second session of the 101st Congress, we are faced with a changing world. The cold war has begun to thaw. Yet the island of Cyprus remains the center of a bitter dispute; 35,000 Turkish troops still occupy northern Cyprus and 200,000 Greek Cypriots are refugees in their own land.

Mr. Speaker, the question of how the longstanding conflict in Cyprus should be resolved is a difficult one for Americans because both Greece and Turkey are NATO Allies. We in the United States must not turn away from this issue because it is a sensitive one. We must not ignore Turkey's violations of international law and the NATO charter, simply because they are perpetrated by an ally. We also cannot overlook the fact the Cyprus conflict weakens our alliance: NATO's southern flank will never be stable as long as the Cyprus question remains. In fact, as a friend, we the United States should use our strong relationships with Greece and Turkey to promote the peace process.

The first step in this process is to recognize the facts. The 1974 Turkish invasion of Cyprus violated section 505(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and, as amended, section 3(c) of the Foreign Military Sales Act and United States-Turkey bilateral agreements. These laws stipulate that U.S. equipment can only be used for defensive purposes. Turkey's occupation of Cyprus also violates the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923 where she renounced all claims to Cyprus and which is still in force. Turkey also violated the terms of the London-Zurich Agreement which established an independent Cyprus in 1960.

The United States currently sends Turkey half a billion dollars annually in foreign assistance. Given Turkey's violation of United States and international law, we must reexamine this commitment. I am not suggesting cutting off assistance to Turkey will solve the question of Cyprus. However, I believe the continuing high level of United States assistance to Turkey gives the United States valuable leverage with the Turkish leadership in working to end this dispute.

For several years, U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar has worked hard to bring about a resolution in Cyprus. I want to commend the Secretary General for undertaking this important dialog to bring about peace in Cyprus. Unfortunately the latest round of talks between Cyprian President Vassiliou, and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Rauf Denktash, stalled without any resolution last June. Since then, Secretary General de Cuellar has been trying to resume the talks without cooperation from the Turkish leadership. In fact, the Secretary General had hoped to begin a new round

of talks next month, but his invitation was rejected by Mr. Denktash.

I would like to take this opportunity to urge Mr. Denktash to rethink his decision and join the Secretary General and President Vassiliou in New York in February. If the complicated problems of Cyprus are ever to be resolved, the Turkish leadership must be willing to compromise. President Vassiliou has consistently supported the U.N.-sponsored talks and has indicated his commitment to a negotiated settlement. The time has come for the Turkish leadership to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I called this special order today to bring attention to the problem of Cyprus, not to condemn any of the participants in this conflict. In the past year, we have seen that insurmountable odds can be overcome. I hope the events in Eastern Europe inspire us to work for justice and peace in Cyprus.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for having this subject discussed today. I think it is a very timely issue.

Mr. Speaker, the winds of change are blowing around the world. From the Soviet Union to Eastern Europe, democracy is on the move along with a growing respect for justice and human rights. The Berlin Wall, once thought to be a permanent fixture dividing the free world and the Soviet empire, has crumbled into souvenirs. Impressive progress is also being made in resolving the problems of South Africa, Angola, Cambodia, and Central America. One problem, however, seems to resist resolution. One dilemma resists the application of fairness, justice, and sensitivity to human rights. Cyprus is that problem.

Since 1974, the tragedy of Cyprus has been with us. The cruel Turkish invasion of that island caused the death of thousands. Over 1,600 Greek Cypriots are still missing along with a number of American citizens. One of them is Andrew Kassapis, a young Michigan resident who was taken from his family's home on Cyprus and never seen again.

That military action resulted in the displacement of 200,000 Greek Cypriots who became refugees in their own land. When they were forced out of the northern part of the island, they left behind land, homes, and personal property worth millions of dollars. Some of that property has been carted off to Turkey. None of those families have been compensated for their huge losses.

In addition to illegally occupying the northern tier of Cyprus with 30,000 troops, who are still armed with

United States supplied equipment, Turkey dispatched 60,000 Anatolian settlers to the island. Even the Turkish Cypriots resent the presence of those "non Cypriots" on that once-united island. What is being done to solve the Cyprus problem?

The United Nations-sponsored intercommunal talks broke down in July when Mr. Denktash objected to how the United Nations presented a draft outline to him. The outline provided food for thought about how the talks should proceed and how the two parties to the dispute could work together to settle the dispute. In recent weeks, Secretary General Perez de Cuellar invited both Mr. Denktash and President Vassiliou of the Republic of Cyprus to the United Nations for talks. Again, Mr. Denktash was offended by the way in which the Secretary General issued the invitation. President Vassiliou, who has shown amazing flexibility and determination to pursue peace talks, willingly accepted the invitation. Mr. Denktash should worry more about solving the Cyprus problem and less about diplomatic niceties. This is the time for forward movement in the peace process if there is ever going to be peace on that divided island.

The key to peace on Cyprus is in Ankara. It is time for Turkish authorities to talk with Mr. Denktash about the reality of Cyprus and the need to settle that longstanding problem.

As the gentleman pointed out, we ought to be looking at the amount of money we are giving Turkey. In fact, I would like to see it sharply reduced to be used as leverage, as the gentleman talked about, to force the two parties to get together to resolve these issues. As changes occur at breakneck speed around the world, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot authorities are increasingly seen by the world community as dragging their feet on a fair and timely resolution of the Cyprus conflict. Turkey is the only democratic nation in Europe that has its troops occupying a foreign country. Turkey wants to join the European Community, but surely must realize that Europe's doors will be closed until Ankara makes progress on the Cyprus problem. It is time to resolve the Cyprus dilemma and make the green line part of history along with the Berlin Wall. It is time to aim for the goals set by President Bush a few years ago when he said, "We seek for Cyprus a constitutional democracy based on majority rule, the rule of law, and the protection of minority rights."

I urge my colleagues to work together with me in Congress to bring about a peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem. Until there is honest progress made on a resolution of that problem, Congress should ensure that

there is no business as usual with Turkey and with Mr. Denktash.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and for his leadership on this vital issue. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus attention on the one wall that is not coming down.

That wall has divided the small island of Cyprus for 15 long years. Since the 1974 Turkish invasion, a green line stretches across the island separating both Turkish and Greek-speaking Cypriots from their traditional homes. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing "green" about this line. It is a collection of barbed wire, walls, and minefields that divides Cyprus and even its capital city of Nicosia. In his new year's message, Cypriot President George Vassiliou asked "can Cyprus be kept away from the earthshaking developments of 1989, thus constituting the only exception in Europe?"

Cyprus is more harshly divided than any European country. Long before this year's reforms, West Berliners had the ability to at least briefly visit East Berlin. Cypriots on the South Side of Nicosia cannot visit the North. As the Berlin Wall comes down, Cypriots see little progress in dismantling their wall.

Despite the lack of progress, we cannot forget the Cyprus problem. This subject will simply not go away. Just 2 weeks ago, the subject came up again during the President of Turkey's visit to the White House. All sides, including Greece and Turkey, recognize that as tensions in Europe disappear, more and more attention will focus on Cyprus.

New forces are also calling for a solution. Many women on Cyprus banded together to form the Women's Walk Home Movement. In their marches across the green line, they focused the international media on the Cyprus problem with the force of peaceful nonviolent protest. My wife, Kathryn, participated in one of these marches and later started the Cypriot Women's Foundation. The foundation's goal is to channel the energies of women on both sides of the green line into bicomunal, interactive projects involving mothers and children. Such projects offer a new vision for the society Cyprus must become. Their efforts show that the pressure on both sides to find a solution is increasing. Let us hope that this year will bring a breakthrough.

That breakthrough may come sooner than we think. It is my understanding that both sides of this conflict have agreed to meet with the U.N. Secretary General next month in New York for a marathon negotiating session. This is very good news. Fol-

lowing the brave initiative of President Vassiliou, he and Mr. Denktash have already spent hundreds of hours mapping out the outlines of draft solutions. This type of negotiation proposed by the Secretary General picks up on the spirit of those private, face-to-face meetings. We here in Congress will be watching these meetings closely.

Mr. Speaker, we share with the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Florida who will speak after me, the very strong conviction that we will see this through, that there will be a reunification of Cyprus, that the foreign troops that are occupying that country will go home, and that the people of Cyprus will be able to live in peace without a wall dividing them.

Perhaps this year we will truly remove Europe's last wall.

Mr. MANTON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] for taking out this special order and for his concern for fairness and justice all over the world, and in particular in this case the population of the island of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in reminding the world of the continued division of the island nation of Cyprus.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, we usually bring up this division—and the illegal occupation of Cyprus by the Turkish Army—on July 20, the anniversary of the invasion by Turkish troops. We're a little early this year, but it's never too early to speak out in the cause of peace and what is right.

It has been more than 15 years since that invasion, 15 years of occupation and colonization by the Turks of 40 percent of the Republic of Cyprus. For more than 15 years now 200,000 Greek-Cypriots have been forced to live as refugees in their own land—4,000 lost their lives outright during the invasion.

If we see yet another July 20 pass without a resolution to this tragedy, it will be a sad, sad day indeed. However, Cyprus President George Vassiliou, in his 1990 New Year message, expressed renewed hope in this time of unprecedented peace.

Indeed, the "rays of hope generated in 1989," rays of hope to which President Vassiliou referred in his message, brighten the promise of a freer Eastern Europe. We cannot help but be inspired by the retreat of communism in East Europe, from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic Ocean.

Indeed, every day another piece of the Berlin Wall is chipped away—and with each chip the way is made more clear for freedom. Yet, on Cyprus the

green line continues to divide the nation, the Nicosia wall still stands. The rays of hope reaching out from Eastern Europe still fall short of Cyprus.

In view of the wave of freedom sweeping European lands held captive too long, in this time of returning peace, I strongly urge President Bush and all of my colleagues here in the Congress to use all influence, to work with all possible energy, to re-create a unified Cyprus—this year.

The United Nations Secretary General has invited President Vassiliou and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash to a new joint meeting. The European Economic Community weighed in last month declaring to Turkey that its application for membership would not even be considered until 1993, in hopes that the Cyprus problem will be resolved.

It is time to push for peace and freedom on Cyprus. Conditions are right; the world awaits the demolition of another dividing wall. Turkey simply must reconsider its outrageous Cyprus policy and the Turkish Cypriots must return to the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, let us extend those rays of hope into the Mediterranean this year. Let 1990 be the year that peace and freedom and unity comes to Cyprus.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McMILLEN].

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for having this special order on Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my continuing anguish over the tragic situation on the island of Cyprus. For 16 long years, the people of Cyprus have endured tremendous suffering, suffering caused by the unwillingness of its Greek and Turkish inhabitants to put behind them their bitterness and anger toward one another. So much has been lost because of this division. Cyprus struggles economically and politically. The island lacks leadership, torn by the strife between two warring factions.

I call upon the Governments of Greece and Turkey to encourage their supporters in Cyprus to end this strife. I recognize that nationalism is a strong emotion. But as long as the Greeks and Turkish inhabitants of the island fight for domination, the nation of Cyprus will not thrive.

I am pleased that the United Nations continue to press for peace in Cyprus. It is my hope that the President of our Government will be more assertive in pushing our Greek and Turkish allies toward a resolution of



this dispute. Not only is it unhealthy for the people of Cyprus that this strife continues, but it is also damaging to the NATO alliance that two members remain at such odds with one another.

At a time when freedom and hope are spreading throughout Europe, Cyprus remains a place where peace continues to be elusive. It is my hope that in the year of 1990 that situation will change.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Tom Manton], for reserving this time so that we might address the tragedy of the wall that has not come down, the wall that divides Cyprus.

As the free world rejoices over the emergence of Eastern Europe into the daylight of civility and democracy, we must not forget the enclave of separation that is Cyprus. All of the historic animosity between the Greeks and the Turks is focused on this beautiful but saddened nation. In this prevailing spirit of renewal, we must turn our attention, and our best statesmanship, toward this persistent problem.

The division of Cyprus must end. The walls of shame must be dismantled.

President Bush, to his credit, and members of his Administration, have met with President Vassiliou and with Mr. Denktash. The President has made clear the United States "unqualified support for continuation of the inter-communal negotiating process under the aegis of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Perez de Cuellar." The President told both leaders that "the United States did not see continuation of the status quo as a solution to the Cyprus problem."

The Secretary General has proposed an extended meeting between Vassiliou and Denktash within the next few weeks. I take this opportunity to urge President Bush to make an extraordinary effort through all means available to him and the Administration to make this promising meeting a success.

I was pleased to see that President Vassiliou's New Year's message to his people was very upbeat regarding the prospect of reconciliation. He asked, "can Cyprus be kept away from the earthshaking developments of 1989, thus constituting the only exception in Europe? Is it possible for the Berlin Wall to be demolished, and for the Nicosia dividing wall to remain?"

Mr. Speaker, again I thank our colleague from New York for taking this time for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to answer those questions with a resounding "no."

The wave of reunion and reconciliation in Europe must not pass over our

friends in Cyprus. Now is the time for a historic breakthrough.

Mr. MANTON. I thank the gentleman and yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking this time and I want to commend the gentleman from New York along with the other Members participating in this special order on Cyprus. It is especially important at this time that we focus attention on the conflict that continues to divide that island nation.

As we witness the fall of the Berlin Wall, the symbolic embodiment of the East-West conflict, if we glanced to the south and the east, we would still find a divided Cyprus. In 1974, the Armed Forces of Turkey invaded the island, calling it a peace movement on behalf of the Turkish Cypriots. A month later they returned for a second invasion, seizing one-third of the island and leaving behind a garrison of Turkish occupation forces. Those forces continue to occupy the northern part of Cyprus to this day.

For those of us who follow this issue closely, we have witnessed a slow progression of attempts at solving the problem—through bicomunal talks, parallel meetings with the Secretary General and seemingly endless dialog—all without success. In the meantime, the Turkish occupation has acquired a feeling of permanence. In 1983, the north unilaterally declared itself independent. The breakaway state, the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, is recognized only by Turkey. Turkey has slowly built up its forces on the island—with overall numbers nearly doubling in the last few years.

With the election of Greek Cypriot President George Vassiliou, we saw the emergence of a determined, pragmatic, and energetic leader who has committed himself to finding a solution to the Cyprus problem. Upon taking office, he immediately set a 1-year deadline for reaching a settlement framework. He has proposed the complete demilitarization of the island and a unified Federal republic that would respect the rights of all Cypriots. While his personal deadline has passed, he continues to stay at the table.

The same cannot be said for his counterpart, Rauf Denktash, the Turkish-Cypriot leader. As the U.N. Secretary General has worked with both sides to narrow their differences, Denktash has grown more reluctant to pursue a solution. Next month, the leaders will meet again with the Secretary General. But, because of Mr. Denktash's objections, that meeting will be an abbreviated version of the original 2-week meeting called for by the Secretary General and agreed to by the Greek-Cypriots.

This meeting comes in a period of sweeping change. With the lessening of superpower tensions and the move toward freedom in Eastern Europe, there is an overflowing optimism about new possibilities, about managing conflict through diplomatic means, and about replacing historic animosities with reconciliation and reconstruction. In this era of possibilities, it is crucial that the conflict on Cyprus not be left behind.

As the two leaders meet next month, it is important that they know that our President, the Congress, and the people of the United States care about the fate of Cyprus; that we are concerned about the continued Turkish occupation of that island; and that we will continue to keep vigilant in our support for a free, democratic, and unified Cyprus.

□ 1520

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, first, let me commend the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Manton] for setting aside time today to discuss an issue that is very important to many of us in the Congress, the continued occupation of the Republic of Cyprus by the Turkish Army.

Over the course of the past year we have seen the deterioration of totalitarian regimes throughout Central and East Europe. The Soviet Union has begun the process of withdrawing its armies from numerous nations including Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany.

But one nation in the region albeit a tiny one, is still under the power of an occupying army. For 16 years, since 1974, Turkish troops have occupied 40 percent of Cyprus, and kept the more than 80 percent ethnic Greek residents of the island from returning to their ancestral homes of many centuries.

The disgrace of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States provides half a billion dollars each and every year to Turkey in foreign aid, much of it military aid. Our U.S. tax dollars are supporting an occupation that both the United States and the United Nations have called illegal and morally unjustifiable.

As we enter the decade of the 1990's and prepare to assist the nations of Eastern Europe in their struggle to become pluralistic societies, I call on the Congress to lend the same assistance to Cyprus. The time is ripe to put pressure on the Turkish Government to end the military occupation of Cyprus immediately.

Presently several dozen members of this body are cosponsors of a bill that I introduced, H.R. 1045, which would

cut off aid to Turkey until significant steps have been taken by the Turkish Government toward ending the occupation of Cyprus. I would note that this bill has cosponsors on both sides of the aisle and has also been introduced in the Senate by Senator LARRY PRESSLER, the distinguished ranking Republican member on the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on European Affairs.

I would urge all Members in this body who wish to send a serious message to the Turkish Government that it is time for occupation of Cyprus to end and to consider joining H.R. 1045 as cosponsors. Until the Turkish Government realizes that we are serious about resolving the Cyprus question, there will be no action on this issue.

I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a very important news story that was in the New York Times only a few months ago. A Federal judge in Indiana ruled that a collection of priceless sixth-century Byzantine mosaics from a church in Cyprus were, in fact, stolen from the Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus and ordered returned to authorities of the church.

I find this particular story significant because it paints a very familiar tale of just one aspect of the Turkish occupation of Cyprus.

In this particular instance, a very beautiful church, revered by the people of Cyprus, has stood intact in the northern part of the island and has been in active use as a church for 14 centuries. It has survived the ravages of countless invasions, wars, fires, and pillagings.

It was not until the Turkish occupation in 1974 that this church was closed to the people of the island. Within the past few years the beautiful mosaics of this church, representing our Lord and ancient saints of the church, were ripped from the walls of this holy place that they have graced over the ages.

Under false Turkish export papers they were shipped from the occupied portion of the island for resale to a museum or art dealer in Western Europe.

Fortunately, these mosaics, valued at over 20 million dollars, have been recovered and are under Federal protection pending their return to the Church of Cyprus.

As I relate this story, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this is not an isolated incident, but what has become a way of life for Cypriot citizens.

The past 15 years have witnessed an attempt by the Turkish invaders to erase everything that is Greek or Cypriot from the occupied 40 percent of the island nation.

Churches and schools have been closed, and in many cases razed. Whole villages have been displaced, and even today, after a decade and a

half, their inhabitants live as refugees in camps. Fifteen hundred Greek Cypriots are still listed as missing from the invasion, and many are presumed to be sitting in Turkish jails as political prisoners even to this day. Of those missing, I might add, five are American citizens who were unfortunate enough to be in Cyprus at the time of the invasion.

The time is here and now to speak up for human rights around the globe. As the people of Europe find liberation, freedom, and democracy, we must demand no less for Cyprus. We as Members of the U.S. Congress have a special duty to Cyprus, because it is largely our military aid to Turkey that makes the continued occupation of Cyprus feasible.

I would close, Mr. Speaker, by again commending the distinguished gentleman from New York for taking this special order today. He along with my fellow Greek Orthodox members in this body, have always been leaders in the forefront of the battle to end the occupation of Cyprus. It is only that by standing together with one voice that we will bring the message home to the Turkish Army—get out of Cyprus.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield, to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON].

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York for arranging this special order today. There is no doubt that the problems facing Cyprus as a result of the Turkish invasion in 1974 deserve the attention and condemnation of this great nation.

Cyprus received its independence from Great Britain in 1960. Only 14 years later, this tiny nation was invaded by tens of thousands of Turkish troops. To this day, Turkey maintains an occupational force of some 25,000 to 30,000 troops. These soldiers have only one mission: to continue the forceful occupation of almost 40 percent of the northern part of Cyprus. The Turkish Government has attempted to hide its continuing invasion by calling its conquest the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus." However, the nations of the world have not been fooled, and only the Turkish Government recognizes this sham government.

Our Government wisely imposed an arms embargo on Turkey after the invasion. This embargo remained in place until 1978. Unfortunately, little has changed since that time.

Greek Cypriots compose about 80 percent of Cyprus' population. The population of Turkish origin is about 20 percent. Nevertheless, the Turkish forces occupy 37 percent of this island nation and they have built a barrier, called the "Green Line," which separates the occupied zone from the rest of the Nation as surely as the Berlin

Wall isolated Communist controlled Berlin. We have seen the Berlin Wall tumble, and now it is time to remove the Turkish forces and eliminate the green line.

It is time for the nation of Cyprus to once again become whole and begin the painful process of healing. It is time for Greek Cypriots to return to their homelands in the northern part of the island and to begin to reconstruct their lives and their communities from the ashes and destruction that the Turks have imposed upon them.

It is time to reopen the churches and replace the statues and icons which have been systematically destroyed by the Turkish forces. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Turkish empire to study the former occupying forces of Eastern Europe and learn the lesson that these repressive governments learned: the burning desire to live free is a part of the human soul and it cannot be repressed through force.

As the sponsor of the annual Greek congressional independence day celebration, I can tell my colleagues that this Turkish invasion force and its brutal suppression of freedom continues to be the most serious issue affecting a lasting peace in this region.

I believe that it is important for America to clearly voice its strongest condemnation of the continued occupation of Cyprus and the brutal repression of tens of thousands of Cypriots. It is through this leadership role that America will contribute to the restoration of Cyprus' freedom and the independence which was stolen from it in that brutal invasion 16 years ago.

Again, I thank Mr. MANTON for providing this opportunity to address this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to review this issue and voice their strongest disapproval of the occupation and lend their support to all efforts to negotiate a lasting peace and restore freedom to the citizens of Cyprus.

□ 1530

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON] for his contribution.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON], as my colleagues have, for providing us this opportunity to speak our minds on the issue of Cyprus. I am pleased to have the opportunity to take a moment today to join my colleagues in focusing the attention of the House and the



Nation on the plight of the people of Cyprus.

Tragically, Cyprus has been a divided island for longer than I have been in this body. The ongoing occupation of Cyprus by Turkish troops has shattered the lives of over 150,000 Greek Cypriots who are literally refugees in their own country—denied access to their ancestral lands for over 15 years.

And not only has this been a personal tragedy, the Turkish occupation has been ruinous to relations between Turkey and Greece, destabilized the peace and security of the Aegean region, and virtually paralyzed United States foreign policy regarding Cyprus.

Through the years, there have been those in Congress and the administration who have argued that our relations with Turkey are too important to risk putting pressure on that government to find a resolution to the tragedy in Cyprus. Events in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe may forever change the political landscape of Europe and the Mediterranean, and with it, the strategic importance of Turkey to our country's security needs. But regardless of where those events—largely beyond our control—leave us, we must today, and in the months to come, begin to reconsider our priorities as they relate to Cyprus, and ask ourselves—

"Can we continue to largely ignore the right of Greek Cypriots to return to their homes, or should we rededicate ourselves to using every means at our disposal to restore that basic human right?"

As it turns out, a mechanism is already in place that should allow a negotiated settlement. The United States has been trying to act as an intermediary by sponsoring talks between President Vassiliou of Cyprus and Rauf Denktash, the Turkish Cypriot leader. But those talks have been stalled since June 1989.

U.N. Secretary General de Cuellar has been trying to get those talks going again. Last fall he proposed a 2-week session of talks to begin on February 12, just a few days from now. But that date was rejected by the Turkish Cypriot leader, and it is unclear when, if ever, Mr. Denktash will meet de Cuellar and Vassiliou.

Turkish Cypriots are now scheduled to hold leadership elections in April and June. There is some question as to whether those elections will be conducted fairly. The United States has an interest in seeing that they are. Many observers believe that if Turkish Cypriots were allowed to speak their will, they would eventually choose a course that would lead to peaceful reunification of Cyprus.

That may or may not be true, but clearly the current Turkish Cypriot leadership is unwilling to enter into a dialog that could lead to reunification.

The United States should pay close attention to the elections in occupied Cyprus. We should press the government of Turkey to ensure that they are free and fair. And when the elections are over, we should push—and push hard—to get U.N. talks back on track. That seems to me to be the least we can do to end the years of tragedy on that divided island.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for allowing me to participate in this special order.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any other Members in the chamber who wish to speak on this special order, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues who are speaking out today for an end to the travail of a divided Cyprus. I commend my colleague from New York, Mr. MANTON, for taking the lead and arranging a special time to speak about this pressing issue.

Given the monumental changes taking place in many places across the globe, it is unavoidable that we should compare what is happening in Europe with what is not happening on Cyprus.

Some will say there are differences between the cases. That is true; there are differences rooted in history, culture, and regional politics. But those differences do not obscure the similarities.

The urges for self-determination and freedom of movement are fundamental to the human spirit. The demand for human dignity transcends borders, walls, fences, checkpoints, and barriers of every description. In Europe the barriers are crumbling. On Cyprus they are not. That must change.

Fifteen years ago Turkish troops invaded Cyprus, divided the island in two, and drove nearly 200,000 Greek-Cypriots from their homes. Over 1,500 people who disappeared in the invasion are still missing. Today, the Green Line which divides Cyprus is patrolled and maintained by 35,000 Turkish troops. Before long an entire generation of Cypriots will have been forced to live in this untenable situation.

For too long the partition of Cyprus has received too little attention from the United States, even though we provide substantial military aid to Turkey. As openings occur elsewhere in Europe, however, I believe that we can no longer keep Cyprus on the back burner. The intransigence of the Turkish regime is beginning to stand out like a sore thumb.

Reconciliation talks under the auspices of the United Nations have stalled. They must be reopened in earnest, without delay. Aside from the humanitarian and human rights concerns, which should be sufficient motivation in themselves, Turkish leaders must realize that neither their security nor the international standing of Turkey is enhanced by continuing the status quo.

I believe that this awareness has begun to penetrate the minds of thoughtful Turks who want their country to join the tide of progressive change. As we begin a new decade,

using whatever leverage we have to press these points with Turkish leaders should be one of our highest foreign policy objectives.

Until the people of Cyprus are reunited under a form of government they are free to choose themselves, with adequate safeguards for minorities, our rejoicing over the changes in Europe will be tempered by the continued pain of a military occupation which should never have happened.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for shining the spotlight on Cyprus today. We must continue to speak out until the light of hope is no longer blocked by the barbed wire and guns of the occupation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Congressman THOMAS MANTON and my other colleagues in the House of Representatives in calling for an end to the illegal occupation of Cyprus by Turkish forces.

During the last 16 years since this unprovoked act of Turkish aggression on July 20, 1974, we have witnessed an unprecedented buildup of the Turkish military in northern Cyprus. We in Congress have seen well-documented evidence verifying the horrendous acts against humanity committed by the Turks during and after the brutal invasion. The Turkish occupiers have been brazen in their attempts to destroy completely the Greek-Cypriot cultural and religious heritage, and they have been ruthless in their desecration of ancient Greek Orthodox churches.

Over 200,000 Greek-Cypriots were displaced from their homes, and over 1,600 individuals are still missing from this invasion—an action which was in direct violation of the United Nations Charter, the Charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Today, we are witnessing dramatic democratic changes taking place in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, but the atrocities of the Turkish Government remain. They must be held accountable for the numerous and barbaric crimes committed against Greek-Cypriots.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my many constituents of Greek descent in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and Greek-Americans throughout the United States, as we symbolically stand at the "Green Line," that infamous barbed wire barricade that has been cut through the heart of Cyprus, and demand that the Turks end this illegal occupation. As a Member of Congress, I am committed to continue to pressure the Turkish Government until they withdraw all of their forces from northern Cyprus, and they begin to show some respect for human rights and human decency.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, ever since the August 1974 Turkish invasion, Cyprus has been a divided nation. Today, 25,000 to 30,000 Turkish troops remain in Cyprus. Thousands of Cypriots dislocated by the invasion have been unable to return to their homes or recover their property.

The Green Line, a barbed wire fence cutting across Cyprus, is a stark reminder of the Turkish invasion. As a result, Cypriots are no longer free to travel, buy a house, or settle in parts of their own country. People have had to

leave the towns and communities that their families lived in for generations.

Since 1974, the United Nations has sponsored negotiations to resolve the differences between the Greek and Turkish-Cypriot communities. Unfortunately, these negotiations have not produced an agreement. In fact, the Turkish community has taken steps to make the division permanent. In 1983, Turkish-Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash declared the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and adopted a new constitution. Turkey is the only country to recognize the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

Denktash's recent invitation for Bulgarian Turks to settle in Cyprus will only make an already deplorable situation worse. Such an influx of settlers would be a blatant attempt to alter the demographic balance on the island and send a clear signal that the Turkish-Cypriots are only interested in the further partition of Cyprus.

The division of Cyprus has continued for too long. So far, diplomacy and negotiation have failed to bring a resolution of the problem. The withdrawal of foreign forces and demilitarization is essential to the peaceful reunification of Cyprus. In addition, human rights must be respected by all sides, including the rights of movement, property and settlement.

Turkey receives over \$563 million in United States aid annually and benefits from the protection of the NATO alliance. The time is long overdue for the United States to actively pursue the unification of Cyprus and to apply pressure on Turkey to remove its troops. The time has come for the Green Line to meet the same fate as the Berlin Wall.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by commending the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable TOM MANTON, for calling this special order to recognize the anniversary of Cyprus' independence.

Thirty years ago, the island of Cyprus became an independent state; however, for 16 years, the northern part of the island has been under the grip of foreign occupation. When Turkish troops invaded, 200,000 Cypriots were driven from their homes, deprived of their possessions, and reduced to refugees in their own land. The decades that have followed have been marked with violence and bloodshed.

Over the years, there has been an influx of approximately 65,000 settlers from mainland Turkey and 35,000 Turkish troops now occupy Cyprus. The demographic and cultural character of the island has been drastically affected by this occupation. As a result, Cyprus is losing its cultural, social, and historical identity.

Today, I am again voicing my support for a negotiated peace and for the reunification of Cyprus. With the dramatic events that have taken place recently in Eastern Europe as an example, now is the time to dissolve the Green Line that divides Cyprus, as the Berlin Wall formerly divided East and West. It is important that we reaffirm our commitment to establishing a genuine and lasting peace through meaningful negotiations, and that the United Nations and Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar join in this effort.

I continue to hope that the people of Cyprus—both the Greek and Turkish-Cypriots—will find a way to live in peace and justice together. On this anniversary of Cyprus' independence, we must pledge our continued efforts to help stabilize this troubled nation.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome Congressman MANTON's leadership in organizing this special order to draw attention to the problem of continued Turkish occupation of Cyprus.

On July 20, 1974, Turkish forces invaded Cyprus; today there are approximately 35,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus, and 60,000 Turkish colonists living on the island.

It is time that we work together to peacefully end the Turkish occupation of Cyprus. Turkey's withdrawal of its troops from Cyprus would certainly demonstrate that Ankara desires to contribute to international détente, and would aid the peace process in that region.

United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar has called numerous times for the removal of Turkish troops and for the protection and recognition of civil and human rights for all people of Cyprus. As recently as this past July, 100 Greek Cypriot demonstrators, who were within the borders of the United Nations buffer zone, were forcibly arrested by Turkish troops. This kind of act is unconscionable, and must not be allowed to occur again.

President George Vassiliou of Cyprus and Rauf Denktash, the Turkish-Cypriot leader, have met to attempt to bring about a reconciliation to these 15 years of occupation. But their meetings ceased this past June. U.N. Secretary General de Cuellar proposed a 2-week session with both President Vassiliou and Denktash, but the meeting, scheduled to begin on February 12, was canceled by Denktash.

I can only hope that both sides will work together to resolve this situation. Fifteen years of forced occupation, bitterness, death, disappearances, and the separation of families is enough. The time has come to end this war. If it is a war of bullets or a war of propaganda and hatred is irrelevant. Peace must return to this island and we in the U.S. Congress must use every available means to see that it is done.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of today's special order on Cyprus and to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] for initiating this important debate.

Mr. Speaker, with the winds of change sweeping through Eastern Europe and regional conflicts approaching peaceful settlements in Southeast Asia, Afghanistan, and southern Africa, it is extremely important that we not lose interest in facilitating a peaceful settlement on Cyprus.

For American policymakers, the conflict on Cyprus is unique in that it has escalated tensions between two NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. Out of fear that an aggressive American effort to resolve that dispute might antagonize one of our allies, policymakers in successive administrations have chosen to downplay or totally ignore Cyprus.

However, we cannot ignore the fact that Turkish forces have illegally occupied over

one-third of this island nation with American defense equipment and we cannot ignore the fact that this occupation has eroded American influence in the eastern Mediterranean.

Mr. Speaker, recent developments suggest that international pressure, effective U.N. diplomacy and assertive American leadership are the essential ingredients to resolving regional disputes. Unfortunately, American leadership is the missing ingredient with respect to Cyprus.

With the strong support of U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, the President of Cyprus, George Vassiliou, has fully committed himself to negotiating a peaceful settlement to this dispute with the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Rauf Denktash. Unfortunately, due to the obstreperousness of Mr. Denktash, the talks are stalled. To the State Department's credit, Special Cyprus Coordinator, Nelson Ledski has been working prodigiously with all parties to the dispute to get these talks back underway. But more must be done.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must pursue a two-track policy in which it supports the U.N. talks while at the same time making it clear to Ankara, that its unjust occupation of Cyprus is entirely unacceptable by democratic standards. Only then, will the people of Cyprus live free of foreign occupation.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, these are times that lend a new breath of encouragement to world affairs. Across the world, longtime adversaries are laying down their arms. Eastern Europe is no longer the battlefield of the cold war. Its citizens are working toward a new era of freedom and democracy.

But on the beautiful island of Cyprus, conflict wages on, now unbelievably, in its 16th year. The Berlin Wall that divides East and West Germany may be coming down, but in Cyprus the awful green line persists. This artificial line of angry barbed wire stretches 110 miles across Cyprus. It divides Greek Cypriots in the south from Turkish Cypriots in the north—and it tears Cyprus apart.

It is time for this wall, too, to come down.

For too long, the city of Nicosia has been another Berlin, with one side enjoying Western prosperity and another left behind. For too long, the fate of those missing during the 1974 Turkish invasion has been hidden. For too long, citizens have been unable to travel freely throughout Cyprus.

Less than 2 years ago, reconciliation seemed a possibility. The Greek Cypriots elected President George Vassiliou, who began meeting with the Turkish leader Mr. Denktash.

Unfortunately, I am sorry to say, talks at this point seem to have broken down. At a time when the world is moving forward in a new spirit of cooperation, Mr. Denktash has left the bargaining table. Even his own people are increasingly expressing interest in joining the Greek Cypriots in negotiations. It is my hope that these talks will resume soon, perhaps in February, as suggested by U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar.

I urge both sides to put the past behind them and look forward to a mutual peace and prosperity. Otherwise, an entire generation will have grown up knowing nothing but hate and division and bitterness.



Negotiations will not be easy. The challenges, in many ways, are far greater than any of those facing Berlin. Leaders will have to work at overcoming cultural and other differences between their peoples.

But the world is moving quickly ahead. It is my fervent hope that Cyprus will not be left behind.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to join with my colleague, Representative MANTON, in bringing to the world's attention the current situation in Cyprus. It has been 16 long years since Turkish forces occupied Cyprus. Winds of change are blowing throughout all of Europe, and it is inevitable that the breezes reach Cyprus. The people of Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and other Eastern European nations have demonstrated the true force of people power. The peaceful transition from autocracy to democracy should serve as a reminder to others that change is possible through negotiation.

The Cypriot people, Turkish and Greek, have both suffered. I believe the status quo is unacceptable. The United Nations have called for a new round of negotiations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots in February in which President Vassiliou has agreed to participate. Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash has not yet responded. It is only through discussion at the negotiating table that a peaceful solution to the situation on Cyprus is possible.

Who would have thought that we would witness the Berlin Wall tumble? The people of Cyprus, both Turkish and Greek, are frustrated by the status quo—a divided nation. It is time for the walls that divide the capital city of Nicosia to come down. It is time that Cypriot refugees, whether they are Greek or Turkish, be permitted to return to their homes. And it is time that occupying forces withdraw to enable the Cypriot people to determine for themselves the direction in which Cyprus should proceed.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the island nation of Cyprus has been divided for almost three decades. For 16 long years, the United Nations have had to station peacekeeping forces to maintain peace between the Greek and Turkish peoples of Cyprus. This is much too long to keep a country divided and much too long for two of our NATO allies to be in a virtual state of war. The time has come for a more focused effort to solve the unfortunate division of this island nation that has continued the past tensions between two important American allies in the region.

The situation on the island of Cyprus has been a constant thorn in the unity and effectiveness of NATO's southern flank. At a time when the divisions between East and West have fallen so spectacularly, it is embarrassing that this dispute continues in NATO's backyard.

Since 1974, the United Nations have attempted to mediate a settlement to the situation. Unfortunately, the negotiation process has remained stalemated. A first step to get the negotiating momentum rolling again would be to put our support behind the United Nations efforts. I hope that as an institution, we can strongly support the United Nations' efforts to seek a negotiated settlement to the situation and continue to urge the administration to do likewise. It would hopefully push the

negotiations down the long road of healing the wounds felt by the Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike.

I urge my colleagues to put their full support behind the United Nations efforts to end this stalemate and finally establish a reunified Cyprus.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, the destruction of the Berlin Wall was one of the greatest moments in this century. After decades of repression, the people of Eastern Europe are embracing new forms of democratic government. In our excitement over their good fortune, however, we cannot forget the repression felt in other countries around the world.

The green line is still dividing Cyprus. Unfortunately after centuries of foreign domination, Cyprus was given only a fleeting glimpse of peace and self-rule as an independent republic. After gaining its independence from Britain in 1960, the small island of Cyprus was invaded by Turkish troops in 1974. With no respect for the sovereignty of this new republic, Turkey brutally invaded and illegally annexed part of this beautiful island. Today 30,000 Turkish troops continue to control the illegally annexed Turkish section of the island and a U.N. peacekeeping force monitors the green line. It is unconscionable to think that it has been 15 years since the Turkish invasion wreaked havoc on the lives of the Cypriots, and there has not yet been a settlement.

The inhabitants of Cyprus deserve the right to be a free and independent State. The basic human right of self-determination should be theirs. The Cypriots are a strong and persevering people and deserve our unwavering support. This conflict has sadly waged on far too long and Cyprus remains a deeply troubled country with no negotiated settlement.

We must send a message of hope and support to the people of Cyprus. They must know that as the walls fall around Berlin, we have not forgotten their struggle for a resolution to this 15-year-old conflict. As a nation founded on the right of self-determination, their struggle has become ours. There should be no doubts as to the United States' interest and efforts in favor of an equitable and peaceful solution for the island of Cyprus. I implore both the Turkish and Greek Cypriots to find an end to the strife on this deeply divided island.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in bringing attention to the continuing tragic division of Cyprus.

Around the world, significant changes are occurring at an amazing rate, but the problem in Cyprus remains. As trade barriers, political barriers, and physical barriers elsewhere are brought down, the continued existence of the green line underscores the stalemate in negotiations to end the occupation of Cyprus.

U.N.-sponsored talks between President Vassiliou and Rauf Denktash, the Turkish Cypriot leader, have been stalled since June 1989. Secretary General de Cuellar has been trying to restart the talks, proposing last fall a 2-week session with President Vassiliou and Mr. Denktash. Unfortunately, the February 12, 1990, date was rejected by Mr. Denktash, who has been evasive about whether and when he will meet. Mr. Denktash seems to be undermining the possibility of U.N.-sponsored talks by attempting to impose unrealistic preconditions for the talks, including recognition of his

illegal regime and the derecognition of the officially recognized Republic of Cyprus.

Several steps can be taken immediately to resolve the crisis in Cyprus. First, serious efforts must be made to start the stalled peace talks. I urge my colleagues to look seriously at the proposals offered by President Vassiliou of Cyprus. These proposals should meet the economic, security, cultural, and political concerns of the Turkish Cypriot people. Second, Turkey could make a major contribution to the process of world peace by starting to withdraw its troops from Cyprus.

The momentum for change around the world continues to grow. I sincerely hope that Cyprus is not left out of this positive movement. The Greek Cypriot people have suffered tremendously. They have lost their land and with that, a part of their heritage and their history. As my colleagues watch world events closely, I urge them to add their voices to the call for a resolution of the tragedy of a divided Cyprus. Thank you.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York, Mr. MANTON, for calling this special order today to focus greater attention on the continued division of Cyprus, and on recent developments which offer the most promising possibility in the last few years of restoring that country's political and geographic integrity.

Cyprus, populated largely by those of Greek ancestry, was illegally invaded in 1974 by Turkey. The Turks, fearful that the new Cypriot government intended to unite with Greece, intervened to protect the rights of the Turkish Cypriot minority. Since that time, Turkey has continued its illegal military presence, and has helped to bring about the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, whose sovereignty is recognized by no one in the world but Turkey, in the 37 percent of the island which it has continued to occupy.

Mr. Speaker, few Americans are aware of the costs incurred by the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. After 15 years, five Americans abducted by the Turkish Armed Forces during the invasion still remain unaccounted for, in addition to more than 1,600 Greek Cypriots. The invasion dislodged more than 200,000 Greek Cypriots living in the Turkish-occupied sector, who are now refugees in their own country. The situation in Cyprus also causes difficulty for the United States in our relations within NATO with our Greek and Turkish allies and is not helpful in our efforts to stabilize the Eastern Mediterranean, a region key to United States strategic and diplomatic interests.

President Bush has stated, "We seek for Cyprus a constitutional democracy based on majority rule, the rule of law, and the protection of minority rights." Since late 1988, U.N.-sponsored negotiations have shown some movement in this direction, as Cypriot President George Vassiliou and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash have engaged in direct dialog with the goal of a new federal republic in a united Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, today a green line divides Cyprus. The United States should increase its support for the U.N. role and enhance its efforts in influencing both sides in reaching a just solution which reestablishes the sovereignty of a united and democratic Cyprus.

while recognizing the unique heritage of all Cypriots and guaranteeing minority rights. The Berlin Wall is falling; it is time that the green line be erased.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, 1989 will long be remembered as the year in which the people of Eastern Europe at last found their voices and declared themselves free. In nation after nation the forces of oppression are being ousted. Discredited in both theory and fact, the occupying forces of totalitarianism and tyranny are being consigned to their rightful place, on the historical scrap heap of failed policies. In their place, democratic reforms characterized by pluralism are taking root. In this, freedom loving people everywhere rejoice.

But as we celebrate the events of 1989, let us not become comfortable or complacent in resting on these laurels. Because even as we have watched the many nations of Eastern Europe shrug off their shackles which have bound them, much remains to be accomplished. Even as we rejoice in present victories let us not forget that the battle is not over. As we take glory in the growing chorus of the song of freedom around the world, let us not fail to notice those still small voices which remain unheard—notable by their silence.

Fifteen years ago the island of Cyprus was invaded by the forces of Turkey. To this day 30,000 Turkish troops remain in Cyprus, enforcing an artificial division of Cyprus which is acceptable to none, oppressive to all, and in direct contradiction to the basic principles of international justice. Yet, despite years of on-again, off-again negotiations, this difficult problem remains as intractable and resistant to resolution as it was 15 years ago. Despite numerous meetings between Cypriot, Greek, and Turkish officials little progress has been made and little hope has been offered for an end to this schism. To say that this is unacceptable does not adequately address the truth of this situation.

I do not have any easy answers to this difficult question. However, I do know that the continued separation of Cyprus by force of arms is wrong, that this situation is untenable, and that it must end. Cyprus is not a nation of Turks anymore than it is a nation of Greeks, it is a nation of Cypriots. The people of Cyprus, no less than the rest of the nations of the world, deserve the right to control their own destinies.

Let us rejoice and join in the celebration of those who have found the voice of freedom—for it is important to recognize the successes of the past even as we struggle to insure their permanency. However, let us also offer a commitment to Cyprus so that one day soon we can also rejoice in a Cyprus which is truly for the Cypriots. Let us commit ourselves as individuals and the collective resources of our great Nation to finding the means whereby this problem can be resolved.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to express our grave concerns over the continued division of Cyprus. For 15 years, the status of Cyprus has remained unsettled. All talks to resolve this conflict—including those sponsored by the United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar—have been unsuccessful. I believe that if we simply allow

this problem to fester, it will give rise to very serious and adverse consequences in the future.

It is time for the wall that separates and divides Cyprus to come down. Today, 40,000 Turkish troops remain on the island, occupying one-third of the country and maintaining the partition. The Turks claim their troops remain to protect the Turkish population. That's what they said 16 years ago, when they first invaded. But that claim today holds no water, at a time when the Greeks pose no threat at all to the Turkish population.

The situation on Cyprus is much like the one that prevailed in Berlin before the wall came down. There is barbed wire strung out along the frontier, command posts, and a buffer zone patrolled by U.N. troops. Greek Cypriots cannot cross back into the Turkish sector, even though their old homes are still standing. So they just come to the barbed wire fence and look longingly at the houses from which they were so suddenly ejected 16 years ago.

In many cases, they were summarily thrown out by the advancing troops, leaving food cooking on the stove, and clothes hanging on the line. Today, entire cities are ghost towns, only because they were once inhabited by Greek Cypriots.

You can see by my remarks, Mr. Speaker, how strongly I feel that negotiations must go forward to resolve the Cyprus problem. The U.S. Government has been far too passive in its support for efforts to settle this conflict and end the partition of the island.

Given our strong relationships with a number of the key actors and governments, we should push hard in the weeks and months ahead to support negotiations and end the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, which is so clearly in contravention of international law.

Thank you very much.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Mr. MANTON, for his leadership in organizing this special order and for his concern on behalf of the people of Cyprus. I wish also to bring to the attention of my colleagues the human rights abuses which have been occurring on that island.

In July and August of 1974 the Turkish Army invaded Cyprus claiming to be the guarantor of the island's independence. In reality, Greek Cypriots have lost many of their freedoms. Turkish soldiers seized control of 40 percent of the total territory, which held 70 percent of the island's economic potential. The United Nations Security Council called for the immediate withdrawal of the troops, but these requests have been ignored. Since then, the Turkish Government has ignored the U.N. and has compiled a questionable human rights record.

Some 20,000 Greek Cypriots were displaced—more than one-third of the island's total population at that time. Attempts were made to undermine the ethnic and religious culture of the Greek Cypriots in the occupied area. Turkish soldiers bombed civilian targets and hospitals, and killed noncombatants including women and children. Thousands of Greek Cypriots disappeared, and to this day,

relatives of the missing do not know if their loved ones are dead or alive.

The Government of Turkey has broken several international laws, ignored the U.N. charter, and violated U.N. International Covenants on Human Rights. For their crimes against the Greek Cypriots, the Turkish Government has not answered repeated inquiries about the missing or faced charges leveled by the European Commission on Human Rights.

To date, Greek Cypriot refugees are still denied the right to return to their homes in the occupied area.

Mr. Speaker, this violation by Turkey against the people of Cyprus is disturbing to me and to the people of Greek ancestry in our Nation. I hope that we in the United States Congress can send a message that will be heard and heeded to end the indignities the Greek Cypriots are forced to endure.

The human rights declaration written by the United Nations applies to all people everywhere, including Greek Cypriots. We must do all that we can to restore human rights to these people.

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 16 years of Turkish occupation, the Island of Cyprus remains divided. A 1974 coup by the Faction of Greek Cypriots and the Greek Army to bring about union of Cyprus with Greece prompted an invasion and occupation which has left refugees on both sides of the "Green Line."

While both Greek and Turkish troops had been stationed on the island of Cyprus, the July 15 coup compelled Turkey to invade militarily to protect its citizens on the island and keep the small country from uniting with Greece. Less than 1 month later, Turkish troops and civilians occupied 41 percent of Cyprus. Over 200,000 Cypriots were forced to flee their homes in the northern territories leaving homes, businesses, and personal belongings behind. The Turkish government brought in 60,000 civilians to live in the homes left empty, giving the Turks a democratic majority. Meanwhile, in the south, the Cypriot refugees were forced to start over from nothing.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Cypriot-Americans in the 18th District of Ohio and the citizens of Cyprus, I appeal for the Turkish troops to leave the island of Cyprus. The citizens of Cyprus desire the rights of free movement, free trade, and freedom to acquire land throughout their country. The people of the Island of Cyprus deeply desire the basic human and democratic right that is fundamental to our great Nation—the right of the minority to be heard.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for a peaceful resolution to the Cyprus dilemma. Since 1964, the country of Cyprus has been divided by "the Green Line," a barbed wire border with armed patrols on each side. With the dramatic events in Eastern Europe over the last few months bringing an end to the Berlin Wall, isn't it time



for an end to this deplorable barricade as well?

Today's special order on Cyprus should cause us all to pause and consider the unfortunate situation in Cyprus. "The Green Line" has unnecessarily divided a country and a people. Hundreds of thousands of Greek and Turkish Cypriots have become refugees within their own country.

As many of you may recall, in 1974 Turkish armed forces occupied the northern half of the island—ostensibly to protect the interests of the Turkish-Cypriots during a coup, supported by the Greek military junta, against the Greek-Cypriot president. These forces took up positions along the U.N.-partrolled "Green Line." Greek-Cypriot National Guardsmen were deployed along the south side of the line in response. Tragically, these same forces continue to patrol the same line to this very day.

The United Nations has made repeated efforts to mediate a peaceful resolution to the Cyprus situation. Unfortunately, recent negotiations, which last year seemed so promising, are now at a standstill. Last July, U.N. General-Secretary, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, presented what he believed to be a mutually acceptable solution. Regrettably, the leader of the Turkish-Cypriot community, Mr. Rauf Denktaş, has not been as flexible as hoped and has chosen to avoid responding to this latest U.N. proposal. Denktaş has chosen instead to perpetuate the course of his illegitimate government. With the exception of Turkey, no sovereign country recognizes the Denktaş regime.

On this day of special consideration for the Cyprus problem, both sides need to be urged to continue diplomatic efforts, no country should be divided by armed barricades. "The Green Line" needs to come down. The displaced Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots need to be resettled. Turkish armed forces and settlers need to return to Turkey. The country of Cyprus needs a constitutional democracy with majority rule and provisions for the protection of minority rights.

Until unity can be achieved, the authority of U.N. forces needs to be respected and sides need to take precautions to avoid human rights violations similar to the unfortunate arrest of Greek-Cypriot women and clergy by Turkish forces this past summer.

On the topic of human rights, I would also like to voice my hopes that the country of Albania will improve its treatment of ethnic Greeks within its borders. The 400,000 ethnic Greeks that live in Albania have been denied such basic freedoms as the right to celebrate Christmas and the right to receive an education in the Greek language. Further, Albania must be held accountable for the whereabouts of the four Prassos brothers who many believe were killed while trying to flee to Greece. Hopefully, the wave of reform sweeping Eastern Europe will reach Albania as well.

As we begin a new decade, let us renew our efforts to promote peace and stability in Cyprus, Albania, and throughout the Eastern and Western blocs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of today's Special Order on Cyprus, and to commend the distinguished

gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] for his work on this issue.

The ambiance of democratization throughout Eastern Europe and the relaxation of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States has caused some of the spotlight to be removed from the difficult regional issues and conflicts that continue to linger on. The territorial dispute on the island of Cyprus stands as a poignant reminder that regional problems must not be forgotten as we seem to improve East-West relations.

It is true that Turkey has occupied one-third of the Cypriot island since 1974, and their presence has adversely affected U.S.-Turkish relations. In fact, the Cyprus issue is one of the sources of tension between Greece and Turkey—two important NATO allies.

Mr. Speaker, effective multilateral efforts must call upon both sides to soften their position. United Nations Secretary General de Cuellar has asked both President Vasiliou and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash to come to New York to once again attempt to work out their differences.

We commend Special Cyprus Coordinator Nelson Ledsky for his outstanding diplomatic efforts thus far, in attempting to bring both leaders back to the bargaining table. The U.S. position on this issue must be clear. The unjust, illegal occupation of Northern Cyprus must end once and for all.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out in support of the human rights of a forgotten majority—the majority Greek population on the island of Cyprus, which is still suffering under the oppression of Turkish military occupation.

A true people's history of modern Cyprus would have to focus on the tragic, ongoing reality that, despite two world wars, the United Nations and NATO Charters, and the Helsinki Accords, the majority Greek population on Cyprus have been denied full personal and political freedom.

In the wake of World War I, a defeated Ottoman Empire reconstituted as the nation of Turkey formally renounced any territorial rights to Cyprus in one of the covenants of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. During World War II, while 600,000 Greeks (more than 9 percent of their total population) died in the war against Nazi Fascism, Turkey stood by as a less-than-neutral toward the Allied cause.

During the long twilight of the Cold War, Turkey has used NATO membership as a vehicle for a military build-up that culminated in the invasion of Cyprus during July and August of 1974. Sadly, that invasion was made possible by the complicity and duplicity of the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger. The Carter administration compounded the disaster by failing to call the Turkish government to account because of its human rights violations, and then actually increasing the scope of foreign assistance and military aid to the Turkish government.

Now, 16 years after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, peace is breaking out all over Europe, as people demonstrate the power of democratic ideas in overcoming authoritarian adversity. We, in the Congress, must broaden the parameters of awareness and concern on this process to include the Greek majority on Cyprus who still yearn to be free of the shack-

les of Turkish military control. Their time has come—and we must help them overcome, so that they may be able to live out the words of the international anthem: "We shall live in peace, someday \* \* \*"

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the dismantling of the "Green Line" in Cyprus. The world stood watching the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, but the Cypriot capital city of Nicosia remains the only divided city in Europe.

This is the era in which united people have brought down tyrants and wall. The walls and barbed wire that divide the Cypriot people shall become the new symbol of oppression in Europe. Let us not forget the lesson of the Berlin Wall. Always and everywhere it is terrible to divide and restrain the citizens of a nation.

On December 28, 1989, thousands of Nicosia residents expressed their wish to live in a reunited city by participating in a candlelit protest. At that vigil, Mayor Lellos Demetriades asked that the world feel their pain and hear their voices. I call today for this free and united nation, the United States of America, not to turn away from this desperate plea.

My colleagues, all of the world's divisive and sinister walls have not yet been obliterated. Let us recognize injustice and work toward its end.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, as we enter a new era of democracy around the world, it's time to end the pain and suffering of some 200,000 Greek Cypriots who remain refugees in their own land because of the illegal occupation by Turkish troops and the forced rule of the minority Turkish/Cyprus Government.

On August 16, 1960, Cyprus gained its independence from British rule. On the same day, the constitution and a series of treaties between the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey, and the new Republic went into effect. The treaties prohibited both enosis and partition of the island between Greece and Turkey, and guaranteed Cypriot independence, territorial integrity, security, and the Republic's constitution.

Shortly after the creation of the Republic, serious differences arose between Greek and Turkish Cypriots over the execution and interpretation of the constitution. In November 1963, a series of constitutional revisions were proposed. These revisions would have eliminated the special protection accord with the Turkish Cypriots in the 1960 constitution, and would have introduced a straightforward majority system of representation. Unfortunately, the Turkish Cypriots resisted these revisions and established their own form of government to rule the northern part of the island.

Since that time, the island has become deeply divided. Communities where people of Greek and Turkish descent once lived side by side have been torn apart. Neighbors were pitted against neighbors. Thousands and thousands of people have lost their homes, while many others have become the innocent victims of the violence of separation. Some 35,000 Turkish troops occupy northern Cyprus illegally, adding to the violence and fear which pervades the island.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to end the violence and restore peace and stability to this beautiful

ful island. I understand that Turkey is important to us geopolitically, and so is Greece. But nothing is more important than the advancement of human rights and the restoration of the fundamental elements of freedom which belong to all Cypriots.

We pride ourselves in America in our commitment to protecting human rights around the world, but we've walked away from the situation in Cyprus. It's tragic that we have not used our leverage more effectively to force the removal of the Turkish troops and the restoration of majority rule to the nation.

At a time when we are promoting the rule of law, free elections, and majority rule in the Philippines, Nicaragua, Panama, and elsewhere, we must aggressively pursue the same goals in Cyprus. We need to elevate this crisis to a higher level, and identify whatever economic, political, and other pressure we can apply to force the withdrawal of Turkish troops and the restoration of democracy to Cyprus. For the good of the people in Cyprus and the world, it's time to bring this unfortunate conflict to an end.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity today to call to the attention of my colleagues, of the American people, and of members of the international community, the situation in Cyprus. I feel it is my obligation to address this issue in order to increase our Nation's awareness of the tragic situation of a nation divided and occupied.

In Cyprus we see one more nation artificially divided, one more nation whose people are demanding that the walls come tumbling down, one more nation demanding freedom, justice, democracy, and peace. These are words that we as Americans use frequently and speak freely in this country. Words, in fact, that we take almost for granted in the United States today. Especially as we watch others around the globe struggle and many of them die to gain just a glimpse of these very ideals. For us, fortunately, these four words are very much a reality—they are, indeed, the backbone of our Nation; they are the very fabric of our country. And they are the source of inspiration for so many others from Beijing to Berlin.

But in some parts of the world the situation is not the same. As we witness this natural outpouring of democratic change taking place around the globe, we assume it is contagious. We hope it spreads. Yet in one corner of the world, the situation remains hopeless, as it has been for many years.

For 15 years now the island of Cyprus has been divided and its people have lived under occupation forces. The United States Congress is on record as stating that there can be no resolution to this situation until the Turkish troops are removed from the island. Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership have for too long subjected the Greek Cypriots to an unlawful occupation of their country.

Today, more than 35,000 Turkish troops occupy Cyprus. Today, more than 200,000 Greek Cypriots live as refugees in their own land. Today, they are victims of unjust human rights violations. During this 15-year occupation much has been said and done in an attempt to bring about change in Cyprus. But, despite the efforts of the U.S. Congress, despite the efforts of the United Nations' Secre-

tary General, despite efforts on the part of the international community, little progress has been made in reaching a settlement on the situation in Cyprus.

If the United States, the world's greatest defender of democracy, of freedom, of justice, and of peace, can inspire so many others around the world, if we can do so much to help the rest of the world to make their dreams become reality, why can we not bring down the dreaded dividing line in Cyprus?

Of all the many aspects of this issue that need to be addressed I would like to focus upon the most important—the people. The people of Cyprus have had their rights as a sovereign nation violated. The right to live peacefully in their own homeland has been taken away from them and what little is left of Greek heritage and culture has been all but destroyed by the presence of over 35,000 Turkish troops. We cannot allow the basic human rights of the people of Cyprus to be completely trampled. We need to promote well-being and stability in Cyprus, and we must work to ensure that the people of Cyprus regain their freedom, that they regain their voice, and that their voice is heard.

Does the Turkish Cypriot leadership still believe that we, preservers of the fundamental principles of democracy, would not stand up and take notice of this grave situation in Cyprus? Does this leadership continue to believe that we, as friends and as an ally to Cyprus, would not attempt to erase the so-called "green line" that divides Cyprus? Does anyone dare think that we will sit idly by and not bring about this long-needed change in Cyprus? They are sadly mistaken if they do. We must and we will continue with our efforts to negotiate peace in Cyprus and to ultimately bring about reunification for this Mediterranean nation.

Cyprus is a very small nation that has been caught up in the turmoil of history. The people living there now will have to travel a long road in order to achieve what we as Americans so proudly refer to as the "democratic way." But with hard work and perseverance, it can be done. Cyprus need not be left out of the current wave of democracy and freedom which so many others are finally able to enjoy. The end of occupation and a unified Cyprus are dreams that deserve to be reality.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the partition of Cyprus and to express my concern about the continuing plight of the 200,000 Greek Cypriot refugees who were forced to flee from their homes when Turkey invaded the northern part of the island in 1974.

President Vassiliou of the Republic of Cyprus should be commended for making every effort to keep open channels of communication with Mr. Denktash, the Turkish Cypriot leader, who has remained unmoved by the need to broach the division that separates Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Mr. Denktash's intransigence in the face of U.N. mediating efforts to resolve the Cypriot crisis is counterproductive and unacceptable, especially in the wake of the historic developments in Eastern Europe.

I would also like to voice my concern about Turkey's policy of colonizing northern Cyprus with over 60,000 of its nationals. Unfortunately,

ly, Turkey has supported the partition of Cyprus by refusing to abide by various U.N. resolutions and the principles of international law. Moreover, the systematic destruction of Cyprus' cultural heritage in the northern third of the island only helps to perpetuate the crisis for future generations of Cypriots.

The continued partition of the island is clearly in no one's interest, and I strongly urge all parties concerned to have the vision and leadership to strive for the peaceful resolution of this conflict. One possible gesture of goodwill by Mr. Denktash would be to uphold the Vienna agreement and allow the return of Greek Cypriot refugees to the Karpas Peninsula. But a more immediate gesture of good will would be to agree to continue the process of U.N. talks with representatives of the Republic of Cyprus.

There is a need to demilitarize the situation in Cyprus and foster a meaningful intercommunal dialog that will hopefully result in the reunification of the country. I wholeheartedly believe that the Cypriot problem can only be resolved by negotiations and constructive dialog and not by the use of military force and political intimidation. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when the green line that divides Greek and Turkish Cypriots is peacefully shattered under the weight of national reconciliation and political reunification.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for bringing attention to this pressing matter. The situation in Cyprus is one about which we all should be keenly aware and seriously concerned.

The persisting division of Cyprus is a situation that the world has tolerated for far too long. Divided since 1974, Cyprus continues to suffer from ethnic divisions that result in internal tensions and the denial of civil freedoms that should be taken for granted. The events of 1974 led to the violent separation of one island into, in effect, two nations.

This division should concern us immensely. First, the instability of Cyprus has severely disrupted the lives of nearly all Cypriots and over time has caused a massive dislocation of the native population. This unrest has resulted in human hardships that the people of Cyprus cannot tolerate and compassionate nations cannot ignore. For example, the right to move about the country freely has been severely impinged. Last July, Greek Cypriot women, in one of a series of demonstrations against the inaccessibility of Turkish-controlled areas, marched into the buffer zone between the two territories. Over a thousand women participated in the demonstration; and many were arrested, even injured. The division of the island into two camps and the consequent restrictions have been so onerous that these women were willing to risk personal harm at the hands of military forces in order to lodge their protest. Moreover, there are nearly 1,600 Greek Cypriots and 6 Americans listed as missing since 1974.

Second, the problems in Cyprus affect relations between two of our NATO Allies, Greece and Turkey. While the events of Eastern Europe are truly encouraging and the threat to the security of Europe appears to be waning, it is still in our best interests that our NATO partners remain on good terms with one an-



other. The historical animosity between these two great nations can only be exacerbated by the conflict in Cyprus, and their relations can only stand to be improved by a Cyprus solution. Moreover, the situation in Cyprus has long complicated our dealings with leaders in Athens and Ankara, and the resolution of hostilities in Cyprus could only improve our standing with our allies.

Third, the maintenance of a U.N. peacekeeping force in Cyprus is a financial burden that our Nation helps shoulder. Ever since hostilities broke out in 1964, the United Nations has maintained a large peacekeeping force of several thousand people and, without a substantial breakthrough in Greek Cypriot-Turkish Cypriot relations, they are likely to remain there. These forces are costly to maintain, so much so that one country, Sweden, has withdrawn most of its troops because of financial constraints. The lack of resolution of the Cyprus problem and the nonimplementation of U.N. resolutions in Cyprus undermine the peacekeeping and peacemaking force of the United Nations.

The history of settlement attempts between the two sides has started and stalled, but mostly stalled, throughout the years. The most recent negotiations between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots were in June of last year, and have since been suspended due to a variety of complications. The importance of reestablishing these negotiations cannot be overemphasized. The key to resolving tensions in Cyprus lies in talks that would institute a viable, bicomunal federal government, one acceptable to both sides. Unless the talks between the two sides are soon renewed, the prospect of a peaceful settlement between the two communities cannot be realized.

There are steps that we can take to encourage a cessation of tensions in Cyprus. The settlement process has been grinding slowly and must be moved along. We should do all that we can to urge both sides to return to the negotiating table and make a concerted and genuine effort to resolve their differences. While negotiations are the essential beginning to relieving tensions, they need not be the only effort. We should also support measures that would foster a meaningful dialog between the two groups on all levels and encourage ties that would result in peaceful interaction. For example, bicomunal projects, freedoms of travel and settlement, and the removal of foreign forces other than those provided for by international agreements should be encouraged. With the opportunity to work peaceably together, without the threat of external military intervention, the citizens of Cyprus can be reconciled.

The situation in Cyprus is one that has gone on long enough. As Members of Congress, we should do all that we can to foster improved relations within Cyprus and encourage meaningful and conclusive negotiations. I urge my colleagues to reflect upon that troubled nation and consider what measures we can take to support the settlement process.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in deploring the continued division of Cyprus.

For too many years, Turkish troops have remained in Cyprus, prohibiting that nation from

finding a political solution to its problems. I should like to add my voice to the many that cry out today to urge that Turkey remove its troops and that all parties work toward the peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem.

Over the past several months, we have rejoiced in the falling of the Berlin Wall. Cyprus, too, must benefit from the greater atmosphere of peace and freedom that is sweeping across so much of Europe. Cypriots, both Greek and Turkish, deserve to be free of the hostilities that have plagued their land for over 15 years. Let us erase the Green Line and bring an end to the division of Cyprus. Let us work to restore the civil liberties for the people of Cyprus. Clearly, the Turkish military presence must end.

Congress has long voiced its disapproval over the continued Turkish presence in Cyprus, and I remain committed to working with my colleagues to achieve peace and reunification for Cyprus.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, American foreign policy often stands accused of sacrificing the long-term interest for short-term gain, losing sight of our most cherished principles in blind pursuit of a specific policy objective. Nowhere is this more evident than in the eastern Mediterranean, where United States policy has drifted away from the long-standing political and human rights problems on Cyprus. Unfortunately, we've witnessed a slow and steady erosion of the American commitment to the reunification of Cyprus ever since the United States embargo was lifted in 1978.

Successive administrations have adopted the military's view that Turkey's strategic importance should be considered over and above—even at the expense of—the withdrawal of Turkish troops and a political settlement of Cyprus. The anti-American rhetoric of the Papandreu administration, the refusal to extradite terrorists, and the difficulty in negotiating base rights further enabled proponents of this view to narrowly define the myriad Greece-Turkey-Cyprus issued and win unprecedented political support.

Unfortunately, the situation on Cyprus has remained relatively unchanged since 1974. Turkish troops still occupy the north, and the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus isn't recognized by a single nation except Turkey. The moral issue has not changed since 1974, so why has U.S. policy drifted?

When the United States embargo on arms to Turkey was repealed 12 years ago, Congress and the President agreed to link United States foreign assistance to Greece and Turkey by establishing a ratio which limited Turkish aid to \$10 for every \$7 provided to Greece. This ratio, which was narrowly preserved in the recent foreign aid bill, was intended to go far beyond the terms of military hardware and address the broader, more important political and military balance between the two countries. It was and remains a clear reminder that the United States regards the Turkish military presence in northern Cyprus as illegal.

As relations steadily improve between the United States and the Soviet Union, Turkey's strategic importance in the region will drastically diminish, and hopefully the underlying political and human rights issues on Cyprus

will become a United States foreign policy priority.

The United States must play an active role to promote progress in the floundering United Nations sponsored talks and continue efforts to promote bi-communal efforts in education and development. The appointment of Nelson Ledsky as special Cyprus coordinator was a step in the right direction, but he can't do the job alone. We, in Congress, must remain vigilant and encourage Mr. Denktash to come to the table this month in New York and resume discussions without insisting on preconditions or statements of intention. There is a lot of work to be done, and now is no time for delay.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, a series of international events has gripped the world's attention. The striking changes in Eastern Europe and the upheaval in Panama have been the focus of attention both in the United States and abroad. It is important that while recognizing and dealing with these developments, we not neglect other areas of the world where ongoing conflicts create greater danger.

Cyprus is one such place. The division of the island, the continuing military buildup, and the unresolved tensions between Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot communities have created a tinderbox. Cyprus has been peaceful for the last number of years. The potential for renewed conflict—which would, of course, have implications beyond the island of Cyprus, and inevitably create a crisis between Greece and Turkey—will remain a danger until a settlement takes place.

In the last 2 years, there has been reason for some optimism on the Cyprus issue. President George Vassiliou, who took office nearly 2 years ago, has advanced several innovative ideas for the settlement of the issues dividing the two communities. Within the last year, President Vassiliou has held talks with Mr. Rauf Denktash, leader of the Turkish-Cypriot community, to explore possible areas of agreement.

Throughout the process, the United Nations has played a constructive role in bringing the parties together. I have introduced legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 205, that declares the support of this Congress for the work of the United Nations on the Cyprus issue and encourages the U.N. Secretary General to begin a new round of negotiations to complete an outline for a Cyprus settlement. I am pleased that this legislation has already been approved by the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East and the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations.

My resolution is one demonstration of the concern in Congress about Cyprus. Another, tangible element is the \$15 million in annual economic assistance we have been providing. Although Cyprus is not a poor country, this funding is a visible statement of our support for the people of Cyprus and our commitment to a peaceful solution of the Cyprus conflict.

Those who care about Cyprus and its future have a task. It is to educate our fellow citizens about the issue and to keep Cyprus high on the list of United States foreign policy priorities. Through these efforts, we can advance

the day when Cyprus will again be one country, unmarred by a division through its midst—a land in which all Cypriots can live in security and prosperity.

Mr. WALGREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to express my support for the people of Cyprus who continue to pursue a long struggle for a unified nation. The United States has a central responsibility for the circumstances facing the Cypriot people.

Cyprus first received its independence from Great Britain in 1960. At that time approximately 18 percent of the population was Turkish and 72 percent of Greek origin. The Treaty of Association and Guarantee established a system that sought to ensure the rights of both peoples through a power-sharing system. But in 1974 the island was unilaterally invaded by Turkish troops allegedly out of Turkish fears that the Greek majority on Cyprus was seeking unification with Greece.

Since 1974, Turkish troops have occupied 40 percent of the island of Cyprus. The line that divides northern and southern Cyprus separates many families from their traditional homes and even from association with family members. Hundreds of Greek refugees from north Cyprus are displaced citizens within their own land. Now Turkey has the distinction of being the only country in Europe that has military troops occupying a foreign land.

The Governments of both Greece and Turkey must put their historic animosities behind them and strive toward a peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem. The United States must strongly urge the Turkish Government to remove their troops from northern Cyprus. The foreign aid that Turkey receives from the United States enables that Government to continue its occupation of a foreign land. Turkey's interest in continued American aid certainly gives us unique leverage with Turkish authorities to move toward a peaceful solution that would end Turkish occupation.

The recent transitions in Eastern Europe can serve as an example to the world. We have seen that it is possible to overcome unsurmountable problems through the courage of people dedicated to freedom. The Berlin Wall has fallen. Now is time for the Green Line dividing north and south Cyprus to be abolished. I commend the people of Cyprus for their dedication to a united nation through a peaceful settlement.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for organizing and coordinating this special order.

We have witnessed the winds of peace blow over Europe in the closing months of 1989. We have watched dictators fall. We have seen the Berlin Wall dismantled. And we have viewed peaceful revolution spread from Poland to East Germany to Czechoslovakia. Sadly, this spirit of peace has not spread to the island of Cyprus. In the midst of these historic events, we should not forget that Cyprus remains an occupied and divided country.

Fifteen years ago, Turkey invaded northern Cyprus, 5 days after a short-lived coup by Greek Cypriot extremists. The island has been divided ever since. The Green Line, marked

by barbed wire and armed guards, divides north and south Cyprus. Today, Nicosia remains the only divided city and divided capital in Europe.

Yet, there is cause for hope. The Greek Mayor of Nicosia, Mayor Demetriades, and his Turkish counterpart, Mayor Akinci have begun to cooperate on infrastructure projects. I am confident that this cooperation between the people of Cyprus may be a precursor of a reunified Cyprus. Yet this reunification will not take place unless negotiations between the Turkish Cypriot leader, Denktash, and President Vassiliou continue to progress.

Hopefully, under the able guidance of the UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar and with the continued assistance of the United States, the spirit of reconciliation and solidarity will bring down the final barrier in Europe, Cyprus' Green Line, and will end the 15 years of division on that island. The Greeks have proven their willingness to negotiate in good faith, and now the Turks must follow suit.

The time for peace in Cyprus is now. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. MANTON for his leadership on this important human rights issue.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, for almost 16 years, 35,000 Turkish troops have illegally occupied Northern Cyprus while 200,000 Greek Cypriots remain refugees in their own land. When Turkish troops invaded Cyprus in 1974, they easily defeated the Greek forces who were outnumbered and who were ill-equipped. In the face of those Turkish forces, the Cypriots stood courageously to protect their native land and in return, they have become hostage to the ruling minority.

We are now in the beginning of a new decade, and the Turks remain on the island in violation of international law. Their presence has been condemned by the United Nations and the Secretary General has consistently pursued unification talks, but to no avail. The Turks occupy 40 percent of Cyprus and their presence simply lends protection to the rump government of the Turkish Republic of northern Cyprus.

The United States' policy has been aimed at preserving the autonomous, united, and sovereign Cypriot Republic. The ultimate goal is the formulation of a democracy where the majority rules and the rights of the minority are protected. At the time of the invasion, the United States imposed an arms embargo and attempted to mediate the dispute between the two nations. Again, to no avail.

President Carter lifted the arms embargo in an effort to encourage the Turks to enter into peace talks and to invite a resolution to the problem. Yet since the lifting of the embargo, I have been disappointed as aid to Turkey has increased while the situation remains unchanged. The United States has continued to pressure the Turks into a peaceful resolution only to be met with threats of an exposed southern flank at NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize the strategic significance of Turkey in the NATO alliance. Yet I do not believe that geopolitics are the

only factor which sustains a secure alliance. The members of NATO are also bound by a common goal of democracy, freedom, and human rights. The alliance was founded in an effort to develop and preserve a civilized world in which those same freedoms on which the United States was founded, can be realized. The occupation of Cyprus does not heed this spirit of the NATO alliance.

Through the Davos process, the beginnings of peace have begun to take root. But the ultimate goal has not yet been achieved; we have not returned Cyprus to her full sovereignty. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to work to encourage democracy in Cyprus and to return autonomy and freedoms to the Cypriot people.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to extend my special thanks to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] for taking the time to coordinate this special order. Clearly, this is an issue which is worthy of the consideration and attention of this House.

Startling events are occurring throughout Eastern Europe. Slumbering eastern bloc countries are slowly awakening from a prolonged sleep under Soviet domination. We—in the West—have marveled at these dramatic changes, as the walls of oppression and isolation have, literally, come tumbling down across the continent. However, at the same time, the island of Cyprus continues to be divided by the green line which stretches across the once unified nation.

Cyprus has been divided since 1974, the year in which Turkish troops invaded the Republic of Cyprus and annexed nearly 40 percent of the island's territory. Surely we must be sensitive to the historic conflicts which contributed to the fateful invasion. But, while no one group is entirely blameless, we must acknowledge that several actions by Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriot leadership have effectively blocked the U.N.-sponsored peace talks and any hope for a resolution of the problem. These actions include the continued presence of thousands of Turkish troops and settlers on the annexed part of the island; the evasiveness of Rauf Denktash, the Turkish Cypriot leader, about whether and when he would meet with President Vassiliou to engage in peace talks; and the ongoing, violent intimidation by Turkish hardliners of Turkish-Cypriot opposition leaders who advocate an end to the illegal Turkish occupation.

In the past, the United States has been reluctant to put pressure on Turkey because of our concern about how such presence would affect Turkey's relationship to NATO and American security interests. But recent events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have clearly diminished these strategic concerns. [It is time now that we strongly reaffirmed America's determination that there be a lasting negotiated settlement of the Cyprus conflict and an end to the Turkish occupation of Cyprus. We must impress upon Turkey that we will not casually acquiesce to continued Turkish intransigence.]



## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUTTO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PORTER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PORTER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BORSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAVAGE, for 30 minutes, today and 30 minutes on February 1.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 60 minutes, today and 60 minutes on February 5.

Mr. SKELTON, for 30 minutes, on February 5.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PORTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

Mr. GALLO.

Mrs. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BORSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mrs. OAKAR.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. LEVINE of California in two instances.

Mr. SANGMEISTER.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. TOWNS.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing February 18, 1990, and ending February 24, 1990, as "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week," to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House earlier today, the House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m. to receive a message from the President.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

## JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 242 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate, the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY];

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO];

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL];

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH];

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS];

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS];

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER]; and

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate at the direction of that body appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL];

The Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON];

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON];

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE];

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ARMSTRONG];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN];

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES]; and

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall

of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor to present to you our former colleague, the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

**THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101-120)**

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the 101st Congress, fellow citizens: I return as a former President of the Senate, and former member of this great House. Now, as President, it is my privilege to report to you on the State of the Union.

Tonight, I come not to speak about the "state of the government"—not to detail every new initiative we plan for the coming year, nor to describe every line item in the budget. I'm here to speak to you and to the American people about the State of the Union—about our world—the changes we've seen, the challenges we face. And what that means for America. There are singular moments in history: dates that divide all that goes before from all that comes after. Many of us in this chamber have lived much of our lives in a world whose fundamental features were defined in 1945. The events of that year decreed the shape of nations. The pace of progress. Freedom or oppression for millions of people around the world.

1945 provided the common frame of reference—the compass points of the post-war era we've relied upon to understand ourselves. That was our world. Until now. The events of the year just ended—the revolution of '89—have been a chain reaction—change so striking that it marks the beginning of a new era in the world's affairs.

Think back—just twelve short months ago—to the world we knew—as 1989 began.

One year ago, the people of Panama lived in fear, under the thumb of a dictator. Today, democracy is restored—Panama is free.

Operation "Just Cause" has achieved its objective. The number of military personnel in Panama is now very close to what it was before the operation began. And tonight, I am announcing that—well before the end of February—the additional numbers of American troops—the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who made this mission a success—will be back home.

A year ago in Poland, Lech Walesa declared that he was ready to open a dialog with the communist rulers of that country. Today, with the future

of a free Poland in their own hands, members of Solidarity lead the Polish Government.

A year ago, freedom's playwright, Vaclav Havel, languished as a prisoner in Prague. Today, it's Vaclav Havel—President of Czechoslovakia.

And one year ago, Erich Honecker of East Germany claimed history as his guide. He predicted the Berlin Wall would last another hundred years. Today—less than one year later—it's the Wall that's history.

Remarkable events—events that fulfill the long-held hopes of the American people. Events that validate the long-standing goals of American policy—a policy based on a single, shining principle: the cause of freedom.

America—not just the Nation—but an idea, alive in the minds of people everywhere. As this new world takes shape, America stands at the center of a widening circle of freedom—today, tomorrow, and into the next century.

Our Nation is the enduring dream of every immigrant who ever set foot on these shores—and the millions still struggling to be free. This Nation—this idea called America—was and always will be—a new world. Our new world.

At a workers' rally—in a place called Branik on the outskirts of Prague—the idea called America is alive. A worker, dressed in grimy overalls, rises to speak at the factory gates. He begins his speech to his fellow citizens with these words—words of a distant revolution:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, [and] that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

It's no secret that, here at home, freedom's door opened long ago. The cornerstones of this free society have already been set in place: Democracy. Competition. Opportunity. Private investment. Stewardship. And of course, leadership.

Our challenge today is to take this democratic system of ours—a system second to none—and make it better.

A better America, where there's a job for everyone who wants one.

Where women working outside the home can be confident their children are in safe and loving care—and where government works to expand child care alternatives for parents.

Where we reconcile the needs of a clean environment and a strong economy.

Where "Made in the U.S.A." is recognized around the world as the symbol of quality and progress.

Where every one of us enjoys the same opportunities to live, to work, and to contribute to society. And where, for the first time, the American

mainstream includes all of our disabled citizens.

Where everyone has a roof over his head—and where the homeless get the help they need to live in dignity.

Where our schools challenge and support our kids and our teachers—and where all of them make the grade.

Where every street, every city, every school, and every child is drug-free.

And finally, where no American is forgotten. Our hearts go out to our hostages—our hostages who are ceaselessly on our minds and in our efforts.

That's part of the future we want to see—the future we can make for ourselves. But dreams alone won't get us there. We need to extend our horizon—commit to the long-view. Our mission for the future starts today.

In the tough, competitive markets around the world, America faces great challenges and great opportunities. We know that we can succeed in the global economic arena of the nineties, but to meet that challenge we must make some fundamental changes—some crucial investments in ourselves.

Yes—we are going to invest in America. This Administration is determined to encourage the creation of capital—capital of all kinds. Physical capital: Everything, from our farms and factories to our workshops and production lines, all that is needed to produce and deliver quality goods and quality services. Intellectual capital: The source of ideas that spark tomorrow's products. And of course, our human capital: The talented workforce we'll need to compete in the global market.

And let me tell you. If we ignore human capital—we lose the spirit of American ingenuity—the spirit that is the hallmark of the American worker. That would be bad. And the American worker is the most productive worker in the world.

We need to save more—we need to expand the pool of capital for the new investments that mean more jobs, more growth. That's the idea behind a new initiative I call the Family Savings Plan, which I will send to the Congress tomorrow.

We need to cut the tax on capital gains—encourage risk-takers—especially those in our small businesses—to take those steps that translate into economic reward, jobs, and a better life for all of us.

We'll do what it takes to invest in America's future. The budget commitment is there. The money is there. It's there for Research and Development, R&D—a record high. It's there for our housing initiative—HOPE, to help everyone from first-time homebuyers to the homeless. The money's there to keep our kids drug-free: 70 percent more than when I took office in 1989. It's there for space exploration—and it's there for education: another record high.



And one more thing: Last fall at the Education Summit, the Governors and I agreed to look for ways to help make sure that kids are ready to learn—the very first day they walk into the classroom. I've made good on that commitment—by proposing a record increase in funds—an extra half a billion dollars—for something near and dear to all of us: Head Start.

Education is the one investment that means more for our future because it means the most for our children. Real improvement in our schools is not simply a matter of spending more. It is a matter of asking more—expecting more—of our schools, our teachers, of our kids, of our parents and ourselves. That's why tonight I am announcing America's education goals—goals developed with the enormous cooperation from the Nation's Governors; and if I might, I would like to say I am very pleased that Governor Gardner, Governor Clinton, Governor Branstad, Governor Campbell, all of whom are very key, in these discussions, these deliberations, are with us here tonight.

- By the year 2000, every child must start school ready to learn.
- The United States must increase the high school graduation rate to no less than 90 percent.
- And we're going to make sure our schools' diplomas mean something: In critical subjects—at the 4th, 8th and 12th grades—we must assess our students' performance.
- By the year 2000, U.S. students must be first in the world in math and science achievement.
- Every American adult must be a skilled literate worker and citizen.
- Every school must offer the kind of disciplined environment that makes it possible for our kids to learn—and every school in America must be drug-free.

Ambitious aims? Of course. Easy to do? Far from it. But the future's at stake. This Nation will not accept anything less than excellence in education.

These investments will keep America competitive. And I know this about the American people: We welcome competition. We'll match our ingenuity, our energy—our experience and technology—our spirit and enterprise—against anyone. Let the competition be free—but let it also be fair. America is ready.

Since we really mean it—and since we are serious about being ready to meet that challenge—we're getting our own house in order. We've made real progress. Seven years ago, the Federal deficit was 6 percent of our Gross National Product. In the new budget I sent up two days ago—the deficit is down to 1 percent of GNP.

That budget brings Federal spending under control. It meets the Gramm-Rudman target, brings that deficit

down further, and balances the budget by 1993—with no new taxes.

And let me tell you, there's still more than enough Federal spending. For most of us, \$1.2 trillion is a lot of money.

And once the budget is balanced, we can operate the way every family must when it has bills to pay. We won't leave it to our children and grandchildren. Once it is balanced, we will start paying off the national debt.

And there's something more we owe the generations of the future: Stewardship—the safekeeping of America's precious environmental inheritance.

As just one sign of how serious we are, we will elevate the Environmental Protection Agency to cabinet rank. Not more bureaucracy, not more red tape—but the certainty that here at home, and especially in our dealings with other nations, environmental issues have the status they deserve.

This year's budget provides over \$2 billion in new spending to protect our environment, with over \$1 billion for global change research. And a new initiative I call "America the Beautiful"—to expand our national parks and wildlife preserves and improve recreational facilities on public lands.

And something else: Something that will help keep this country clean, from our forestland to our inner cities, and keep America beautiful for generations to come—the money to plant a billion trees a year.

And tonight, let me say again to all the members of the Congress: The American people did not send us here to bicker. There's work to do—and they sent us here to get it done. And once again, in the spirit of cooperation, I offer my hand to all of you. Let's work together to do the will of the people. Clean Air. Child Care. The Educational Excellence Act. Crime and Drugs. It's time to act. The Farm Bill. Transportation policy. Product liability reform. Enterprise Zones. It's time to act together.

And there's one thing I hope we will be able to agree on. It's about our commitments. I'm talking about Social Security.

To every American out there on Social Security, to every American supporting that system today, and to everyone counting on it when they retire: We made a promise to you—and we are going to keep it.

We rescued the system in 1983—and it's sound again. Bipartisan agreement. Our budget fully funds today's benefits—and it assures that future benefits will be funded as well. The last thing we need to do is mess around with Social Security.

There's one more problem we need to address. We must give careful consideration to the recommendations of the health care studies now underway. That's why tonight, I am asking Dr. Louis Sullivan—Secretary of Health

and Human Services—to lead a Domestic Policy Council review of recommendations on the quality, accessibility and cost of our nation's health care system. I am committed to bring the staggering costs of health care under control.

The "state of the government" does indeed depend on many of us in this very chamber. But the State of the Union depends on all Americans. We must maintain the democratic decency that makes a nation out of millions of individuals. I have been appalled at the recent mail bombings across this country. Every one of us must confront and condemn racism, anti-semitism, bigotry and hate. Not next week, not tomorrow, but right now. Every single one of us.

The State of the Union depends on whether we help our neighbor—claim the problems of our community as our own. We've got to step forward when there's trouble—lend a hand, be what I call a point of light to a stranger in need. We've got to take the time after a busy day to sit down and read with our kids, help them with their homework, and pass along the values we learned as children. That's how we sustain the State of the Union.

Every effort is important. It all adds up—it's doing the things that give democracy meaning. It all adds up to who we are—and who we will be.

And let me say, that so long as we remember the American idea—so long as we live up to the American ideal—the State of the Union will remain sound and strong.

And to those who worry we have lost our way—well, I want you to listen to parts of a letter written by James Markwell—PFC James Markwell, a 20-year-old Army medic of the 1st Battalion, 75th Rangers. It's dated December 18th—the night before our Armed Forces went into action in Panama. It's a letter servicemen write—and hope will never be sent. Sadly, Private Markwell's mother did receive this letter. And she passed it on to me out there in Cincinnati.

Here is some of what he wrote: "I have never been afraid of death, but now he is waiting at the corner. . . . I have been trained to kill and to save, so has everyone else. I am frightened of what lays beyond the fog, yet. . . . Do not mourn for me, revel in the life that I have died to give you. . . . But most of all, don't forget that the Army was my choice. Something that I wanted to do."

"Remember I joined the Army to serve my country and insure that you are free to do what you want and live our lives freely."

Let me add that Private Markwell was among the first to see battle in Panama, and one of the first to fall.

He knew what he believed in. He carried the idea we call America in his heart.

I began tonight speaking about the changes we've seen this past year. There is a new world of challenges and opportunities before us. And there is a need for leadership that only America can provide.

Nearly 40 years ago, in his last address to the Congress, President Harry Truman predicted such a time would come. He said: "As our world grows stronger, more united, more attractive to men on both sides of the iron curtain, then inevitably there will come a time of change within the communist world."

Today, that change is taking place.

For more than 40 years, America and its allies held communism in check, and ensured that democracy would continue to exist. Today, with communism crumbling, our aim must be to ensure democracy's advance. To take the lead in forging peace and freedom's best hope—a great and growing commonwealth of free nations.

To the Congress and to all Americans, I say it is time to acclaim a new consensus at home and abroad—a common vision of the peaceful world we want to see.

Here in our own hemisphere, it's time for all the people of the Americas—North and South—to live in freedom.

In the Far East and Africa, it is time for the full flowering of free governments and free markets that have served as the engine of progress.

It is time to offer our hand to the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe. So that continent—for too long a continent divided—can see a future whole and free.

And it's time to build on our new relationship with the Soviet Union—to endorse and encourage a peaceful process of internal change toward democracy and economic opportunity.

We are in a period of great transition, great hope, yet great uncertainty. We recognize that the Soviet military threat in Europe is diminishing, but we see little change in Soviet strategic modernization. Therefore, we must sustain our own strategic offense modernization and the Strategic Defense Initiative.

But the time is right to move forward on a conventional arms control agreement to move us to more appropriate levels of military forces in Europe—a coherent defense program that ensures the U.S. will continue to be a catalyst for peaceful change in Europe. I've consulted with leaders of NATO—and in fact, I spoke by phone with President Gorbachev, just today.

I agree with our European allies that an American military presence in Europe is essential—and that it should

not be tied solely to the Soviet military presence in Eastern Europe.

But troop levels can still be lower. So tonight, I am announcing a major new step—for a further reduction in U.S. and Soviet manpower in Central and Eastern Europe to 195,000 on each side.

This number, this level, reflects the advice of our senior military advisors. It is designed to protect American and European interests—and sustain NATO's defense strategy. A swift conclusion to our arms control talks—conventional, chemical and strategic—must now be our goal. That time has come.

Still, we must recognize an unfortunate fact: In many regions of the world tonight, the reality is conflict—not peace. Enduring animosities and opposing interests remain. Thus the cause of peace must be served by an America strong enough—and sure enough—to defend our interests and our ideals. It's this American idea that for the past four decades helped inspire this Revolution of '89.

Here at home—and in the world—there is history in the making—and history to be made. Six months ago, early in this season of change, I stood at the gates of the Gdansk Shipyard in Poland at the monument to the fallen workers of Solidarity. It's a monument of simple majesty. Three tall crosses rise up from the stones. Atop each cross, an anchor—an ancient symbol of hope.

The anchor in our world today is freedom. Holding us steady in times of change—a symbol of hope to all the world. And freedom is at the very heart of the idea that is America.

Giving life to the idea depends on every one of us. Our anchor has always been faith and family.

In the last few days of this past momentous year, our family was blessed once more—celebrating the joy of life when a little boy became our 12th grandchild.

When I held the little guy for the first time, the troubles at home and abroad seemed manageable and totally in perspective.

Now, I know you're probably thinking: that's just a grandfather talking.

Well, maybe you're right. But I've met a lot of children this past year—across this country, as all of you have, and everywhere from the Far East to Eastern Europe. All kids are unique. Yet, all kids are alike. The budding young environmentalists I met this month, who joined me exploring the Florida Everglades. The little leaguers I played catch with in Poland—ready to go from Warsaw to the World Series. Even the kids who are ill or alone—God bless the boarder babies, born addicted to drugs and AIDS and—coping with problems no child should have to face. But, you know, when it comes to hope and the future: Every

kid is the same. Full of dreams. Ready to take on the world. All special because they are the very future of freedom. To them belongs this new world I've been speaking about.

So tonight I'm going to ask something of every one of you. Let me start with my generation—with the grandparents out there. You are our living link to the past. Tell your grandchildren the story of struggles waged, at home and abroad. Of sacrifices freely made for freedom's sake. And tell them your own story as well—because every American has a story to tell.

Parents: Your children look to you for direction and guidance. Tell them of faith and family. Tell them we are one Nation under God. Teach them that of all the many gifts they can receive, liberty is their most precious legacy. And of all the gifts they can give, the greatest, the greatest is helping others.

And to the children and young people out there tonight: With you rests our hope—all that America will mean in the years and decades ahead. Fix your vision on a new century—your century. On dreams we cannot see. On the destiny that is yours—and yours alone.

And finally, let all Americans—all of us together here in this chamber, the symbolic center of democracy—affirm our allegiance to this idea we call America. And let us all remember that the State of the Union depends on each and every one of us.

God bless all of you, and may God bless this great Nation, the United States of America.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and charges d'Affaires of foreign governments.

#### JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.



**MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT  
REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE  
OF THE WHOLE HOUSE  
ON THE STATE OF THE UNION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 1, 1990, at 11 a.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2388. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report of two violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act which involved the excess obligation of the fiscal years 1979 and 1980 allotments for the American Embassy in Moscow, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2389. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report of expenditures and accomplishments, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c), (e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2390. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of the company's balance sheet as of December 31, 1989, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 43-513; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2391. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts, fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2392. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2393. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2394. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2395. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a

draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt distinctive counterfeit deterrents for exclusive use in the manufacture of U.S. securities and obligations, to clarify existing authority to combat counterfeiting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting the second report on a list of projects which have been authorized, but for which no funds have been obligated during the preceding 10 full fiscal years, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 579a; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2397. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, transmitting the third status report on certain highway demonstration projects, as of September 30, 1989, pursuant to Public Law 100-17, section 149(j)(1) (101 Stat. 202); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2398. A letter from the Under Secretary, International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the second quarterly commodity and country allocation table showing current programming plans for commodity assistance under titles I/III of Public Law 480 for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1736b(a); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

2399. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the report of progress on developing and certifying the Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System [TCAS], covering the months of September through December 1989, pursuant to Public Law 100-223, section 203(b) (101 Stat. 1518); jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Science, Space, and Technology.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIXON: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Report entitled "In the Matter of Representative Gus Savage" (Rep. 101-397). Referred to the House Calendar.

**PUBLIC BILLS AND  
RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend Title 46 of the United States Code relative to laws governing the coastwise trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3922. A bill to guarantee cost-of-living adjustments in fiscal year 1991 for persons receiving retired pay or an annuity under military retirement and survivor benefit programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3923. A bill to guarantee cost-of-living adjustments in fiscal year 1991 for persons receiving benefits under civil service retirement and military retirement and sur-

vivor benefit programs; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Armed Services.

By Mr. BUECHNER:

H.R. 3924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the personal exemption amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 3925. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish national safety belt and motorcycle helmet use requirements, to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct informational programs to promote the use of motor vehicle safety equipment, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY:

H.R. 3926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove certain limitations on the exclusion of income from United States savings bonds when used to pay higher education tuition and fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. Cox, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MANTON, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 3927. A bill to provide for 200,000 additional immigrant visas in each of 5 fiscal years for certain independent immigrants from countries that have traditionally denied freedom of emigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. OAKAR (for herself and Mrs. LLOYD):

H.R. 3928. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to locally based nonprofit organizations, local governments, and Indian tribes to provide home repairs and modifications for older and disabled homeowners; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BATES, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. SIKORSKI):

H.R. 3929. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for budget process reform, to repeal sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a pay-as-you-go basis for Federal budgeting, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3930. A bill to reauthorize the waste treatment construction grants program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUETTE (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MACHTELY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FAXON, and Mr. PURSELL):

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that President Guillermo Endara of Panama should be invited to address a joint meeting of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. Res. 313. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 2d session of the 101st Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr.

AUCOIN, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. UDALL, Mr. YATES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FROST, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BATES, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. STARK, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. GRAY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. HUBBARD):

H. Res. 314. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives permitting medicaid funding of abortions in the case of rape or incest; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H. Res. 315. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the 2d session of the 101st Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. SABO.  
H.R. 84: Mr. SCHUMER.  
H.R. 89: Mrs. PATTERSON.  
H.R. 101: Mr. ROYBAL.  
H.R. 303: Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. MARTIN of New York.  
H.R. 995: Mr. HYDE.  
H.R. 1090: Mr. BARNARD.  
H.R. 1167: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1400: Mr. MOORHEAD, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1451: Mr. BLILEY.  
H.R. 1470: Mr. KANJORSKI.  
H.R. 1574: Mr. DIXON and Mr. WOLPE.  
H.R. 1676: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.  
H.R. 1730: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1746: Mr. FAUNTROY.  
H.R. 2057: Mr. BRYANT.  
H.R. 2096: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 2202: Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 2228: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2270: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. LANCASTER.  
H.R. 2562: Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 2575: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. LONG, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BATES, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ARCHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ROBINSON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 2584: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BATES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 2754: Mr. FROST, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2816: Mr. STALLINGS.  
H.R. 2819: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2826: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2832: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3162: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 3380: Mr. WEISS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COX, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 3401: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CLARKE, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 3412: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3454: Mr. ESPY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3475: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 3500: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BUECHNER, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 3505: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3539: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3604: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. JAMES, Mr. HOLLOWAY, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 3625: Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 3639: Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 3713: Mrs. LLOYD and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3766: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 3772: Mr. COX, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 3777: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 3821: Mr. PENNY and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 3831: Mr. FRANK, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3835: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 3848: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3869: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 3870: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ESPY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 3880: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H. R. 3914: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATES, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. BORSKI.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. SUNDKUIST.

H.J. Res. 255: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, and Mr. CONTE.

H.J. Res. 367: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.J. Res. 426: Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. GRANT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. EARLY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. UPTON, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.J. Res. 446: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRANT, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 462: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FAUNTROY,



